IISR

James Battorff

An Interpretation of the English Bible

James, I and II Thessalonians and I and II Corinthians

BY

B. H. CARROLL, D.D., LL.D.,

President of Southwestern Baptist
Theological Seminary

EDITED BY

J. B. CRANFILL, LL.D

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

LONDON AND EDINBURGH

Copyright, 1916, by
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	Editor's Introduction	vii
I	Historical Introduction to James	1
II	Analysis and Exposition of Chapter I	13
III	The Faith of Our Lord Jesus Christ	29
IV	Teachers and Tongues	37
V	General Admonitions and Applications	47
VI	Introduction to I Thessalonians	64
VII	Exposition I Thessalonians	76
VIII	A Lesson on Christian Morals	86
IX	A Body of Rules	98
X	Introduction to II Thessalonians	108
XI	The Second Coming of Christ and the Man of Sin	118
XII	The Plan of Salvation—Some Lessons on Discipline	135
XIII	Introduction to I Corinthians	145
XIV	Salutation of I Corinthians, Eloquence and Factional Divisions	156
XV	The Preacher and Factions	168
XVI	The Revolt Against Paul's Apostolic Authority	177
XVII	The Relaxation of Morals	188
XVIII	Perversion of the Lord's Supper	200

CHAPTER		PAGE
XIX	The Misuse and Abuse of Miraculous Gifts	215
XX	Love the Greatest Thing in the World	227
XXI	The Gift of Tongues	237
XXII	Marriage, Divorce and the Position of Women	253
XXIII	The Resurrection of the Dead	266
XXIV	Death and the Resurrection of the Dead	276
XXV	A Great Collection, Many Adversaries, Household Churches, etc.	287
XXVI	Introduction and Exposition of II Corinthians	294
XXVII	The Two Covenants	304
XXVIII	The Gospel Ministry and the Coming Glory	318
XXIX	The Ministry of Reconciliation	331
XXX	The Great Collection for the Poor Jerusalem Saints	342
XXXI	Paul's Reply to His Enemies	348

EDITOR'S INTRODUCTION

IN this volume Dr. B. H. Carroll is at his best. If the great interpreter of God's word shone resplendent in former discussions—and he did—he reaches the zenith of his interpretative power in the work that follows.

We have now had nine volumes of the series—"Revelation," "Genesis," "Exodus-Leviticus," "Numbers to Ruth," "Daniel and the Inter-Biblical Period," "The Pastoral Epistles," "The Four Gospels, Vol. I," "The Four Gospels, Vol. II," and "The Acts." Others are to follow.

There is no hesitancy, no incertitude and no tergiversation in these rich discussions of these five great New Testament epistles. Taking them in the order of their production, Dr. Carroll treats them chapter by chapter, verse by verse, and point by point. He leaves nothing to be desired. His analysis of the Book of James, and his proofs that it was written by the brother of our Lord, are unmatched in any like matter known to me. His work is cumulative. He adds proof to proof, and so indissolubly are they linked together that each argument dovetails into its companion postulate, thus forming an irresistible and irrefutable whole.

When the learned author reaches the interpretation of the Apostle Paul he achieves his climax. I have a working knowledge of the leading commentaries on the Pauline letters. Leading them all is Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul." There is nothing in

the English tongue more charming in diction or more felicitous in expression than that great work, and yet, as an interpretation of Paul and his epistles it does not rank with the work of Dr. B. H. Carroll. As an evidence of this fact I give herewith a quotation from the present volume in which, after characterizing the thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians as the "most exquisite gem in all literature," Dr. Carroll says:

"If I had all knowledge, not in one department, but in all departments, so that I myself was the biggest encyclopedia in the world; so that I myself was a walking library of all the records of history and achievements of science in any of its departments; so that whatever man has ever known since the world was, down to the present time, I knew; and if I had all faith (not saving faith, but that faith that enables one to work miracles), so as to remove mountains; if I could make Himalaya and the Ural change places; if I could pile the Alps upon the Apennines, and the Apennines upon the Pyrenees, as the old giants are said to have done Pelion and Ossa; if I could look at Ætna, Vesuvius, Hecla, Stromboli, and Popocatepetl and say, 'Put out your fires,' and they would become extinct in a moment, and I have not love, *I would just be nothing.*"

Need I say more? Is not this book its own best herald? I so feel, and shall only add that my heart sings with inexpressible joy as these words are penned. When I wrote the introduction to Revelation and Genesis —(they were published in that order)—the great author was alive and in reasonable health. I was not then the legatee of a great trust, made so by a deceased friend's will. It is all different now, and in giving this and other volumes to the world I have upon my heart the sense of duty well performed—duty to a loved one gone, whose

faith in me led him to bequeath to me in trust all of his great interpretations of God's Word. He thus assigned to me the joy and the privilege of continuing the task of putting his great commentaries into this permanent form in which they go forth to cheer and bless God's saints until the end of time.

When I had finished the task of editing this volume my eyes were wet with tears. If the author of a work of fiction is saddened when he takes leave of the airy creatures of his brain, how much more did my heart grieve to part company with the Great Apostle to the Gentiles when my task of editing was done! And there came yet other tears as I thought of the noble author whose pen shall be silent evermore.

And now, this great book begins its gracious work. The body of its author lingers in the tomb, but it will one day come forth clothed upon with that dazzling immortality of which he so much loved to preach and write.

J. B. CRANFILL.

DALLAS, TEXAS.

I

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION

THE first point to which attention is called is the place of this epistle in the New Testament canon. This Letter of James, and some others, were called *antilegomena.* In other words, they were in dispute or in doubt. Later on the Letter of James received universal acceptance. After a careful examination into its claim it was received by all Christian people as a part of the New Testament, until the Reformation. Luther, in the preface to his commentary on it, uses language which may be translated thus: "A very strawy epistle." The thought with him was that it flatly contradicted the teaching of Paul on justification by faith, and Luther would not accept anything from anybody that contradicted that teaching. The trouble with Luther was that he misconceived the teaching of James. It is quite true that the Letter of James was slow in coming into circulation, but it gradually worked its way into general acceptance, and there is no just ground for questioning its authenticity or canonical place.

The heading in the King James Version is, "The *General* Epistle of James." The word, "general," is left out of the American Standard Revised Version. The Greek word, *katholikos,* meaning "general," or "universal," is not found in the Bible, neither in the Greek of the O. T. nor in the Greek of the N. T. That is one of my objections to the position of certain Baptists on

the universal, or catholic church; they should not insist upon using a word which has not the recognition of the Word of God, neither in the Old nor in the New Testament. It is certain that the word "general" was put there some centuries after Christ, and it was meant to indicate the character of seven letters: James; I and II, Peter; I, II, and III John, and Jude. The letters of Paul to the Romans, to the Corinthians and to Timothy, are special letters. The word, "catholic," when it first came into use, did not mean orthodox, but simply, "general," as opposed to particular, or special. Later it came to mean orthodox—"the holy Catholic Church." It does not belong in the New Testament, and hence the revisers very wisely left it out.

Who wrote this letter, how, when, why, and to whom was it written? As to who wrote this book, our own answer is, James, the eldest half-brother of our Lord; that is, he was younger than Jesus, who was Mary's first-born, and the first son of both Joseph and Mary. And yet it is a question which has been very much controverted in some of its phases, and I must go a little into the controversy. In Mark 6:3, the people of Nazareth say concerning Jesus, "Is not this the carpenter, the Son of Mary, and brother of James, and Joses, and Judas, and Simon? And are not His sisters here with us? And they were offended in Him." The first question to be determined is, what was the relation of these four brothers there mentioned, and these sisters whose names are not given, to Jesus, the Son of Mary? I refer the reader to some elaborate discussions on the conflicting theories. The best, clearest, simplest, and most forcible is found in Dr. Broadus' "Commentary on Matthew" on chapter 13:55. In Schaff's "History of the Christian Church" (page 272, Vol. I, second edition), the author

discusses the matter with great clearness and force, and agrees with Dr. Broadus throughout. Another book is "Lightfoot on Galatians," one of the finest commentaries ever prepared. Dr. Lightfoot elaborately discusses the question of the relationship of these four men and these unnamed sisters of our Lord. He takes a different position from Dr. Broadus and Dr. Schaff. These authorities are accessible, and a bright student who wants to keep up with the discussions on important matters in the Bible should acquaint himself with these discussions.

Here is the sum of the whole matter: There are three theories as to who these people were. One theory is the one advanced in my answer, that they were the younger half-brothers and sisters of Jesus, Joseph and Mary being their parents; hence it is called the *brother-theory,* as Dr. Broadus describes it. This is styled in classical history, "The Helvetian Theory." About 383 A. D., Rome, which was coming into power, attacked this position.

Second theory: They were the children of Joseph by a former marriage and were half-brothers of our Lord. That is called the theory of Epitheanus. That is the theory Lightfoot advocates, and the theory upon which the Greek Catholic Church stands. (The first theory is sometimes called the Protestant theory.)

Third theory: That they were cousins of Jesus, the children of Mary who was a sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus. And this theory maintains the identity of James, the brother of our Lord, and James the son of Alpheus, in the list of the twelve apostles. It also maintains the identity of Jude, the author of another letter, with Judas, not Iscariot, another one of the apostles, and that the Simon mentioned in Mark 6:3 was another one of the apostles. So this theory claims that three of the brothers of Jesus Christ were apostles. Then it also

identifies Alpheus and Cleopas. This is the Roman Catholic theory, and its object is to prove the perpetual virginity of Mary, the mother of our Lord. Later, the Roman Catholics by an "infallible" Bull declared the perpetual virginity of Mary, and made its acceptance essential to salvation.

The Catholic theory is in every way preposterous. The idea of making three brothers of Jesus members of the original twelve of the apostolic college, when just a little while before Jesus was crucified, John says emphatically that His brothers did not believe on Him, and every time they are mentioned it is in contradistinction to the apostles, has no basis in fact. They are never mentioned in a way to make it possible to believe that they were apostles. Evidently sentiment had much to do in influencing some Protestants to deny that they were brothers of Jesus.

We count it settled that James, Judas, Joses, and Simon, mentioned in Mark 6:3 as brothers of Jesus, *were* really His brothers. This brings us to another question: Did James, this brother of Jesus, write this letter? It could never have been James, the son of Zebedee, because we have an account of his death in Acts 12. All of the arguments go to show that the author of this book is James, the half-brother of Jesus.

Having settled as to who wrote the letter, we want to get an idea of the writer, and shall now form a connected Bible history of the man. We will take Dr. Broadus' "Harmony of the Gospels" and follow it as far as it goes.

I. John 2:12 (Harmony, page 20), reads: "After this we went down to Capernaum, He, and His mother, and His brethren and His disciples; and they abode there not many days." Here the names of the brothers are not given, but it shows that this family of children follow

that mother and go around after Jesus. That is just after Jesus worked His first miracle. In the working of the first miracle it speaks only of Jesus and His mother being present, but undoubtedly His brothers were there then. That is to say, that when He left to go to that wedding, His mother and brothers went with Him, and from that wedding they went and sojourned all together a little while in Capernaum. Jesus gets an invitation to a wedding, and in order to get Jesus they invite His mother and the more obscure members of the family.

II. Matthew 12:46, 47, with Mark 3:31, 32, with Luke 8:19, on page 59 of the Harmony. Let us see Matt. 12:46, 47: "While He was yet speaking to the multitudes, behold, His mother and His brethren stood without, seeking to speak to Him. And one said unto Him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren *stand without, seeking to speak to thee.*" Then Mark: "And there come His mother and His brethren; and, standing without, they sent unto Him, calling Him. And a multitude was sitting about Him; and they say unto Him, Behold, thy mother and thy brethren without seek for thee." Luke says, "And there came to Him His mother and brethren, and they could not come at Him for the crowd." It must be clearly stated as to what the object was. Here Jesus was teaching, and He was so very busy that He did not stop to eat. The report of that comes to His mother and these half-brothers of His, and they come there to arrest Him, just exactly as we would get out a writ of lunacy for any man that will work so continuously without stopping to eat. It is important to see the relation of these brothers to Jesus as it is presented in the scripture. It is on that occasion that He says, resenting the interference with His work by His family, "Who is my mother and my brethren?" And waving His hand

to His disciples He says, "These are my brothers. Whosoever doeth the will of my Father, the same is my mother, my brother, and my sister," placing discipleship and obedience far above any fleshly relation to Him. As later He was going to the cross a woman cried out, "Blessed is the mother that bore thee," and He said, "Yea, rather blessed is she that doeth the Word of God."

III. Matthew 13:55 with Mark 6:3, on page 70 of the Harmony: *This is the second time that Jesus comes to Nazareth,* and coming into His own country He taught them in their synagogue, insomuch that they were astonished and said, "Whence hath this man wisdom, and these mighty works? Is not this the carpenter's son? Is not His mother called Mary?" Notice what Jesus said about that: "A prophet is not without honor, save in his own country, and among his own kin, and in his own house." So we see that up to this time He was without honor with His own kin.

IV. John 7:3, on page 102 of the Harmony: *"Depart hence, and go into Judea, that thy disciples also may behold thy works which thou doest.* For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly. If thou doest these things, manifest thyself to the world. For even His brethren did not believe on Him. Jesus therefore saith unto them, My time is not yet come; but your time is always ready. . . . I go not up yet unto this feast." That was not a very great while before His crucifixion, and shows the attitude of His family toward Him so far.

V. I Cor. 15:7, on page 229 of the Harmony: After He rose from the dead *He appeared unto His brother James.* So far as the Bible teaching goes, up to the time after the resurrection when Jesus appeared to James, the very man that wrote this letter, He had not been a

Christian. Hence he could not have been one of the twelve apostles.

VI. Acts 1:14. When He ascended into heaven, the angel said to those who were looking at His up-going, "Why stand ye looking into heaven?" Then it is said that they went back to the upper room, Mary and His brethren. There, doubtless with the crowd, they received the baptism of the Holy Spirit. There were 120, including the brothers.

VII. Gal. 1:19 with Acts 9:27. That is Paul's first visit to Jerusalem. He says, "When I made that first visit to see Peter, I saw him, but did not see any other of the apostles, but I did see James, the brother of our Lord." He did not say that James was an apostle. Dr. Broadus and Dr. Schaff both say that the Greek and also the margin in the revision do not imply that James was an apostle; it says, "I saw no other apostle but Peter, but I saw James."

VIII. Acts 12:17. Peter escaped from prison and told the crowd that was praying in the house of John Mark's mother to go and tell James that he had escaped, indicating that by this time James occupied a position of authority. In other words he was pastor of the first church at Jerusalem. The apostles were not pastors; they had general work to do.

IX. Acts 15, with which compare Gal. 2:9. That is the time that the great conference was held at Jerusalem concerning Paul's work as to whether the Gentiles were to be received into the kingdom of God without becoming Jews. James presided over that meeting, as the pastor of the Jerusalem church, because the man who made the trouble came from his church, and the first church at Antioch had referred this question to the church where the trouble had originated. James makes

a speech on that occasion, as well as Peter, Paul and others, and James is unquestionably the author of the letter which was adopted by the church.

X. Gal. 2:12. That is after the whole matter had been settled by that conference; Paul says that, at Antioch when certain ones came from James, Peter and Barnabas began to dissimulate; they had heretofore been eating with the Gentiles.

XI. I Cor. 9:5. That shows he was a married man.

XII. Acts 21:18. That is on the occasion of Paul's last visit. James is still the pastor.

XIII. The last reference, except the letter itself, Jude, verse 1: "Jude, . . . brother of James."

Here then are thirteen references which put clearly before us the author of this letter. He was an intense Jew, very much devoted to the law and to the customs of his people. That he never did become such a Christian as Paul and others we shall see as we study his epistle.

We have found the writer of this letter to be James, the son of Joseph and Mary, and half-brother of our Lord. And we have studied his history in the Gospels, Acts and Epistles, up to the time that he writes this letter. Now for some further questions.

I. To whom does he write this letter? The answer is: Not to the Gentiles anywhere, not to Jews of any kind in the Holy Land, not to Christian Jews in the Holy Land, but to Christian Jews of the dispersion. As the first verse says, "James, . . . to the twelve tribes which are of the dispersion." That brings up the old question of the "lost ten tribes." And this context shows that James does not consider that they were lost. The O. T. shows that the ten tribes who were transported to Syria, and most of whom never returned, were not

lost. A great many of them came back, and the continuity of the tribes was kept up, which can be proven by many scriptural references, both Old and New. The Greek word, *diaspora,* the dispersion, needs to be understood. The word, "dispersion," occurs a number of times in the Bible, and it means that a large class of Jews, who at different times were carried away into several captivities, or who went away for purposes of commerce, or trade, and settled in foreign countries, losing in the long lapse of time their mother tongue, and speaking only the tongues of the people where they lived, losing a great many of the scriptural customs of the people who lived in the Holy Land, yet maintained their nationality. These people came up to the great feasts. They were there on the day of Pentecost, when James received the baptism of the Holy Spirit; they were there from the banks of the Euphrates and the Tigris, from Mesopotamia, which means "between the rivers;" from all places in Asia Minor; from Southern Greece and Rome and Northern Africa. And they remained there until they were first dispersed by the persecution of Saul of Tarsus and the persecution mentioned in Acts 12. As they had gone away, James writes to them. They had been there together in that great meeting, very probably, on the day of Pentecost. The first deportation of these people was when the ten tribes were carried into captivity, then later the Jews in Judea were carried away, still later Alexander established a great number at Alexandria, in Northern Egypt, at the mouth of the Nile, and Pompey carried a great number of them into captivity to Rome. In Egypt they received special privileges. A temple was built there, and an immense part of the influence on the thought of the world comes from the Alexandrian Jews. I am explaining now

to whom this letter was written, and what was the occasion of the writing. These people had been there and had been through this long persecution; now they were scattered to their several homes, and James is writing to them.

II. When did he write it? He could not have written it after A. D. 62, for he was killed at that time, as is told by Josephus. He did not write it after A. D. 50, because there is an absence of reference in it to later controversies. So that my opinion of the time is somewhere about A. D. 45, corresponding in date with the incidents mentioned in Acts 12. There was then a great persecution raging. James, the son of Zebedee, was killed, and Peter was imprisoned. The members of the church were scattered abroad. James was the head, or pastor of that church. There were probably 100,000 members in it. We can see the concern he would feel when these people were all driven abroad. The reasons for this early date are not merely the appropriateness of the occasion, which has just been stated, but it is evident from this letter itself that the line of demarkation between Christians and Jews was very slight. The Christians were still meeting in the synagogues. Later, they separated from the Jews at the synagogues, and either rented houses of worship, built them houses, or met in private homes.

III. Why did he write this letter, or what was his object? Three reasons, from the letter itself, evidently influenced him more than all others put together. The first one is that these dispersed Jews were suffering severe trials and persecution, and he wanted to show them how to receive and to bear these trials. In the second place, a great many Jews had accepted Christ intellectually, but were not regenerated. Just like the devil, they believed in God, and so James says, "Thou

believest there is one God; thou doest well: the devils also believe and tremble." It was this barren faith that was not influencing many of their lives for good. And then a characteristic of them at home and abroad was that they were a very "fussy" people, regular "Kilkenny cats," fighting in their synagogues at every meeting, and eight years later destroying the nation by their fighting in the streets of Jerusalem against each other. He is writing to these suffering people, some of them holding on to Christ with a spirit of nominal faith, to show them that the true faith endures suffering and is fruitful in life.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the meaning of *antilegomena*, and what are the *antilegomena* epistles?
2. What did Luther call the epistle of James, and why?
3. Is there any just ground for questioning the authenticity of this letter?
4. How did *catholikos* come to be used in this title, and when?
5. What did it mean originally?
6. What did it come to mean later?
7. Who wrote this letter?
8. What three theories concerning the relation to our Lord sustained by the children named in Mark 6: 3?
9. What is included in each of these theories?
10. In general terms, how do Protestants, Greek Catholics and Roman Catholics align themselves on these theories?
11. What is the object of the Catholic theory?
12. What was the "infallible" Bull respecting this?
13. What caused some Protestants to deny that those named in Mark were brothers of our Lord?
14. Where may a Bible student find the clearest and strongest presentation of each theory?
15. Why could it not have been James, the son of Zebedee, who wrote this letter?
16. Holding the Protestant theory, how do you meet the objections based on John 19: 26, 27?
17. Observing the order of time in citing passages, trace the New Testament history of the James named in Mark 6: 3.
18. From this history show how it was impossible for him to be one of the twelve apostles.
19. Who, then, was the author of this letter?
20. What was his character, reputation and death, according to Josephus and other historians?

21. What his acquired position among Jerusalem Christians?
22. What his position both as a Jew and a Christian?
23. To whom was this letter written?
24. What old question does verse 1 bring up?
25. What James' position on that question?
26. What is the meaning of the Greek word *diaspora?*
27. What is the difference between the Jews of the dispersion and the Jews of Palestine?
28. On what occasions did they assemble at Jerusalem?
29. What were the great deportations of the Jews?
30. What the occasion of this letter?
31. When did he write it?
32. What the proof?
33. Why did he write this letter?

II

AN ANALYSIS AND THE EXPOSITION OF CHAPTER I

Analysis

THE salutation, from whom to whom, 1:1.

The body, or matter, of the letter:

I. *Concerning Trials from Without.* God himself chastens His children in love, and often permits Satan and evil men to afflict them in malice as a test of faith and as a discipline, therefore—

1. Count them for a joy through discipline, 1:2-4. (Compare with case of Job, who did not know how nor from whom to count them, and with the case of Paul, who did know.)

2. If you need wisdom in order to this—ask God for it, 1:5-8. (Compare the case of Solomon, I Kings 3:5-13 and 4:29-34.)

3. But ask in faith, 1:6. (Compare the Lord's teaching in Mark 5:36; 9:23, 24 and Paul's, Rom. 4:18-21, and Heb. 11:6.)

4. Having regard to other laws or conditions of acceptable prayer, 4:3.

5. For there are two kinds of wisdom, unlike in origin, nature and result, 3:13-18. (Compare Gen. 3:6; II Cor. 11:3; Gal. 3:1; I Cor. 1:18-22.) (Compare the Greek legend of Minerva, the goddess of wisdom, springing full grown from the brain of Jupiter, with Milton's

representation of Sin, in the form of a beautiful woman, coming from the brain of Satan—"Paradise Lost," Book II.)

6. How the foregoing directions may be made to apply impartially to both rich and poor brethren, 1:9-11.

II. *Concerning Temptations from Within,* 1:13-17. Note how the same word in one connection means a trial, in another connection means an incitement to evil.

1. Incitement to evil not from God, 1:13-17.

(a) Because opposed to His nature, 1:13, 17, 18. He is the Father of lights. He is unchangeable. He willeth our regeneration. (Compare I Tim. 2:4 and Ezek. 33:11.)

(See the author's sermon on "God and the Sinner.")

(b) Because opposed to His practice of giving good things only, 1:17.

2. Incitement to evil from the Devil, 4:7. (Compare Gen. 3:1-5; II Cor. 11:3; Gal. 3:1; I John 3:8-12.)

3. The commission of sin man's own act, 1:14. This appears from the analysis of sin, 1:14, 15. The complete order is:

(1) Incitement by Satan. (2) Desire. (3) Will to gratify it. (4) The deed. (5) Death. (6) Hell. (Compare the genesis and development of the first human sin, Gen. 3:1-8 and the case of Achan, Josh. 7:20, 21. See the relations of Satan, Sin, Death and Hell, and Dogs of Remorse in "Paradise Lost," Book II, lines 648-814.)

III. *Concerning the Word of God.*

1. Its offices:

(a) The means of regeneration, 1:18.

(b) The mirror for disclosing imperfections, 1:23.

(c) The perfect law of liberty, 1:25.

2. How communicated in effecting regeneration, 1:21.

Note the "Implanting" as of a seed, and compare the parable of the sower, the seed, and the four kinds of soil, Matt. 13:4-9, 18-23 with Jer. 4:3. See also I Pet. 1:23.

3. How received when so communicated, 1:21.

4. How treated when received:

(a) Forsake the evil it condemns, 1:21.

(b) Do the good it enjoins, 1:22.

(Compare Isa. 1:16, 17; 55:7; Matt. 7:24-27. See also John 14:15; 15:14; Acts 2:37; 16:30, 31; 22:10 with 26:19.)

OBSERVATIONS

The Mirror.—Let the reader explain the mirror-illustration, showing how and why the Word of God is so used.

The case of Mr. Moody, his dirty boy and the mirror, showing the mirror's use, not for washing, but to disclose dirt, or imperfection, and by thus convincing the one looking in it of the need of cleansing. Let the reader compare the mirror-illustration of James with Paul's mirror-illustration (II Cor. 3:18) and point out clearly the distinctions. Illustrate Paul's use by the Peruvian Temple of the Sun in Cuzco. Read Keeble's poem on Paul's illustration.

The Law of Liberty.—Let the reader fix clearly and firmly in his mind the New Testament idea of liberty, who is the liberator, what the bondage from which he delivers, how the Word of God operates in securing the liberty, and why it is a perfect law of liberty. To this end see the discussion in John 8:31-36; Gal. 4:21-31 and 5:1; Rom. 6:14-20.

Compare Ingersoll's lecture on "Liberty for Man, Woman and Child," delivered in Waco, with the author's

reply thereto. Read Bishop Soule's sermon on "Perfect Law of Liberty," in "Methodist Pulpit of the South," and mark the points from which you dissent, if there be any.

IV. *A Definition of Practical Religion:*

1. Negative, *i. e.,* vain religion, 1:26.

(a) Deception of heart.

(b) Unbridled tongue.

2. Positive, *i. e.,* pure and undefiled, 1:27.

(a) Keeping oneself unspotted from the world.

(b) Visiting the fatherless and widows in their affliction.

OBSERVATIONS

Note all the N. T. uses of the words here rendered "religion," "religious."

Derivation of the English word.

Read F. W. Robertson's sermon (in Vol. III) showing the mission of James to teach the moral-rectitude side of the gospel rather than dogma.

V. *Concerning Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ.*

1. It must be held without respect of persons, 2:1-7, *i. e.,* the conduct of one believer in Jesus toward another believer in Jesus must have regard only to the claims of a common humanity and of a common salvation, disregarding distinctions based on race, nationality, tribe, caste, sex, titles, honors, social position, wealth or poverty. (Compare Deut. 1:7; Luke 18:42-45; 22:24-27; Acts 10:34; Gal. 3:28; Col. 3:10, 11.)

2. It must fulfill the royal law, 2:8.

3. It must be held without respect of commandments, 2:9-12.

Note the unity, or solidarity, of the law. Illustrate it. Who wrote the couplet concerning men who

"Compound for sins they are inclin'd to,
By damning those they have no mind to?"

What the legend of Jupiter and the two bags?

4. It must be evidenced by good works, 2:14-20. Case of Abraham, 2:21-24. Case of Rahab, 2:25. Questions:

(a) What said Luther of this letter, and why?

(b) And yet what says Luther about faith and works in his preface to the epistle to the Romans?

(c) In what sense do works justify?

(d) Meaning of "perfect" in 2:22?

(e) What says Paul of the relations between Grace and Faith on the one hand, and good works on the other hand? (See Eph. 2:8-10; Titus 2:11-15 and 3:4-8.)

(f) What the theory of Dr. J. B. Link, editor "Texas Baptist Herald?"

(g) Why was Rahab's case selected by James, and in Heb. 11:31?

VI. *Concerning Teachers,* 3:1-18.

1. A caution against many teachers, 3:1.

2. The teacher must bridle his tongue, because:

(1) This makes the perfect man. Note the relative power of the tongue, 3:2-4. Note the illustrations—the bridle, the helm, the forest fire.

(2) Because the devil's tongues of fire are contrasted with the Spirit's tongues of fire at Pentecost, 3:6-12. These tongues are restless, untamable, forked, full of deadly poison, worlds of iniquity, set on fire of hell, setting on fire the whole course of nature.

(3) The teacher must seek the true wisdom, because there is another wisdom earthly, sensual, demoniacal. Note:

The tongue has slain more than the sword, and has

burned up more homes and cities than all the incendiaries in the annals of time.

VII. *General Applications and Exhortations.*

1. Inordinate lusts originate strife and nullify prayer, 4:1-3.

2. The spirit of divine love within us is jealous against the world-love tempting us, 4:4-6.

3. The great direction, 4:7-10.

4. Censoriousness libels laws and usurps the divine prerogative of judgment, 4:11, 12.

5. The twelve tribes are dispersed by the lust of commerce, which presumes on the future and ignores the divine will, 4:13-17.

6. The follies and iniquities of the rich, 5:1-6.

7. The coming of the Lord teaches patience, 5:7, 8.

8. The outlet for great emotions, 5:9-13.

(1) Not murmuring.

(2) Not swearing.

(3) But prayer or praise. The case of Job.

9. Directions for the sick, 5:14-18.

(1) Send for the elders of the church.

(Query: Who are they?)

(3) Anoint the patient with oil.

(Why? Is this direction binding now? Is this the Romanist extreme unction?)

(4) The promise.

(5) Confession of sin.

(Query: Is this the Romanist auricular confession?)

(6) Elijah's case the example of prayer.

(Query: Is it right now to pray for rain?)

10. Conversion of a sinner, 5:19, 20.

(Query: Meaning of "shall cover a multitude of sins?")

We shall now give the main points in the analysis of the first chapter, as follows:

First, *Salutation—from whom to whom,* 1:1.

Second, *Trials from without* and how to receive them, 1:2-13.

Third, *Trials from within,*—their origin, development and termination, 1:13-17.

Fourth, *The Word of God,*—its nature, its offices and how to treat it, 1:18-25.

Fifth, *Seeming and Real Religion,* 1:26, 27.

I will now commence the exegesis according to that analysis. I would not, for worlds, have this Letter of James left out, and if when we get through, the reader does not see that it is a great letter and of inestimable value, then I shall question his judgment.

First the salutation, 1:1: "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are of the dispersion, greeting." We have, in an introductory chapter, specified what James this was. We see that he counts himself God's servant, and the servant of Jesus. Considering that all during the life of Christ he did not believe in his brother, and that he was converted only at the resurrection of Christ, it is astonishing in this book to see how complete is his faith in Jesus as the Messiah: "The Lord Jesus, the Christ." Those to whom he writes, the twelve tribes of the dispersion, we have just considered.

We now take up trials from without, and how they are to be received. "Count it all joy, my brethren, when you fall into manifold temptations." Pretty hard thing to do, isn't it? Job had a hard time counting his trials joy, and we notice in Paul's case it makes him shouting happy because God counted him worthy to suffer for the Lord Jesus Christ. But we have to have religion

to do that. "Count it all joy." Why should it be? "Because the trying of your faith worketh patience." "Tribulation," says Peter, "worketh patience."

A most charming lady, a member of my church in Waco, and one of the sweetest spirits that I ever knew, came to me one day and said:

"I just pray and pray for patience, and about the time I think I am patient, here comes some new trouble. Tell me about it."

"Why," I said, "that is the mill that grinds patience, viz.: tribulation, and so if you really want to be patient, then you must count these tribulations that come on you, joy, for they will bring you the patience, if you are rightly exercised by them. And in order to profit by it, let patience have her perfect work, that you may be patient and endure, wanting nothing."

The word, "perfect," does not mean sinless in the N. T. at any time. It means mature. Perfection means maturity. Just here the trouble comes up with any of us when subject to these trials from without—we are not wise enough to know how to receive them. Hence, the next direction, "If any of you lack wisdom, let him ask of God that giveth to all men liberally and upbraideth not, and it shall be given him." He knows that a lack of wisdom oftentimes causes us to fail.

The case of Solomon is in point. He was a young man when he was made successor to his father, and while he was offering sacrifices in the tabernacle, God came to him in a dream at night and said (how would you, dear reader, like to be approached by day or night and have God pressing this question on you?), "What do you want? Make a selection. I will give it to you." Solomon says, "Lord, give me wisdom. I am a little child, and I do not know how to go out or to come in,

and you have put me at the head of a great people, and I have to discharge my duty. I must have wisdom." God was so pleased that He not only gave him wisdom, but riches and honor, and many other blessings.

How different would be the answer of most people to that question. Perhaps one would say, "I want a spring bonnet. That is the thing that is standing between me and happiness." Another would say, "I want to feel my fingers in the neck of my enemy." What a tremendous thing is that wisdom! I do not mean knowledge. There is much difference between wisdom and knowledge. The wisest man is not the man that knows. Wisdom is the *application* of knowledge. To know just what to do, to know just how to do it, and to know how to do it at the right time—that is wisdom. It is a rare gift or qualification.

I heard an old Baptist deacon say, "Our pastor, if we ever get him up in the pulpit, is not only a Boanerges, a son of thunder, but he is a Barnabas, a son of consolation, but just as soon as he steps down out of the pulpit, he has not sense enough to lead a goose to water. He needs a guardian." And the old deacon told the truth. He was called "the Spurgeon of Texas," and he was called also the "inspired idiot." Out of the pulpit an idiot, and in the pulpit a flame of fire. He was a school-mate of mine.

Most of the trouble that comes upon churches comes from a lack of wisdom on the part of the pastor. They do not know how to handle with the proper delicacy cases of discipline. Without ever understanding it, a great many pastors make themselves the occasion of a split in a church, of endless strife and confusion. You can get wisdom in no other way than by asking for it. One says, "I asked for it, but did not get it." Let me

give the next verse. "But let him ask in faith, nothing doubting, for he that doubteth is like the surge of the sea, driven by the wind and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive anything of the Lord; a double-minded man, unstable in all his ways." Ask in faith: "Whatsoever ye ask in my name, according to the law of God, and believe, ye shall receive."

The most of us are like the old woman, who read where it says, "If you have faith equal to a grain of mustard seed you could say to the mountain, be moved into the sea, and it would be moved." So she concluded she would try it, and she prayed that a certain mountain might be moved into the sea. The next morning she says, "There it is. I knew it was going to be there. It is just as I expected." This is the way of our faith in praying.

These trials from without come upon rich and poor alike. The rich in the trial finds that his wealth has taken to itself wings and flown away, and he is brought down to a low estate. They have their trials. The poor man also has his. They are not the same in all cases, but there is no road from here to heaven that does not pass through tribulations. A man that properly endures trials that come upon him from without has this glorious incentive, that when he is tried he shall receive the crown of life which the Lord has promised to them that love Him. In the letters of Peter we find out how he treats the same subject.

We now come to the trials from within: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God; for God cannot be tempted with evil, and He himself tempteth no man: but each man is tempted, when he is drawn away by his own lust." We have the responsibility of that inward sin, and we must not put it on God. God

never enticed anybody to do evil. The enticement must come from our own desire. Eve looked upon the fruit of the tree of death, and it seemed to her good for food. She desired; she was enticed by her desire. Achan, notwithstanding the prohibition of God about the spoils of Jericho that were devoted, consecrated to God, saw the goodly Babylonish garment, and a wedge of gold, and he wanted them. Now, it isn't worth while for Achan to say, "God put me in a position to see that." The origin of our desires cannot be put on the shoulder of some one else.

Here is the finest analysis of the inside sin, its development and its termination, that I know of anywhere: "Then the lust, when it hath conceived, beareth sin: and the sin, when it is full grown, bringeth forth death." Desire, sin, death! We will have occasion more than once to call attention to James' power to analyze a fact, to show its development, its culmination, and its fruit. In verse 17 he shows why that this enticement to sin does not come from God: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, coming down from the Father of lights, with whom can be no variation, neither shadow that is cast by turning." That is what comes from God. If it is a good gift, a perfect gift, it comes from above; it comes from the Father of lights; it comes from that God with whom is no variableness or even shadow of turning. Apply what James says as to how to treat trials that come from the inside. That is the secret of life. This is an intensely practical writer, and if one cannot apply what he says, then he will go through life soured, unhappy, unprofitable.

Let us look at his great discussion on the Word of God, which extends from the 18th to the 25th verse, inclusive. The analysis says, "The Word of God, its

nature, its offices, and how to treat it." It is a seed, an implanted seed: "Receive with meekness the implanted word." The word is "planted"—*"the implanted Word of God."* And how often do we find that the Word of God is treated as a seed! "The sower went forth to sow," the parable of tares, the parable of the seed that groweth by itself, and then in the Psalms, "He that soweth in tears shall reap in joy," and "he that goeth forth weeping bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again rejoicing, bringing his sheaves with him." And the passage in Peter, "born again, not of corruptible seed, but of incorruptible, by the Word of God that liveth and abideth forever."

If the Word of God as to its nature is an implanted seed, then what are its offices? First, it is an instrument of regeneration. The record says, "Of His own will He brought us forth by the Word of truth." How is regeneration to be brought about? By preaching the Word. The sower goes out and sows the Word—the seed, which is implanted, and becomes the instrument of regeneration by the Holy Spirit. What is the second office of this Word? That is expressed in verse 25: "But he that looketh into the perfect law, the law of liberty, and so continueth, being not a hearer that forgeteth, but a doer that worketh, this man shall be blessed in his doing." There the Word of God is called the law of liberty, that is to say, "Whoever takes the Word of God reaches real liberty."

Ingersoll came to Waco when I was pastor there, and delivered his notorious lecture on "Liberty for Men, Women and Children," and I replied to it from the pulpit: "If the Son shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed," and showed what was real liberty and how this liberty is to be found.

The Word of God brings liberty; to deliver from the bondage of sin, the bondage of Satan; it translates us into the kingdom of God. We can get these three lessons: (1) It is the instrument of regeneration. (2) It is a mirror for revealing sin. (3) It is the perfect law of liberty.

I heard Dr. Richard Burleson preach a great sermon on "How shall a young man cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy Word." That is in Psalm 119. Every verse of it has reference to the Word of God. The young man in his ways is inclined to be a slave. How shall he be free? "How shall he cleanse his way? By taking heed thereto according to thy Word." "The entrance of thy Word giveth light." Whosoever liveth in darkness and dark places is in slavery. There must be light in order to be free.

One of the most famous Irish orators in an address pictured Ireland as a woman in shamrock and bound, and then pleaded for the liberty of Ireland, and as he held up his hands he said, "There shall come a day in the providence of God when Erin, poor Erin, shall be redeemed and regenerated and disenthralled forever." If it ever comes it shall be by the Irish people taking greater heed to the Word of God. This is the way to get that kind of liberty.

Let us now review a little. This letter was written by James, the half-brother of our Lord, the son of Joseph and Mary. It was written from Jerusalem. It was written about A.D. 45. It was written to the dispersed Jews that had become Christians.

In the analysis of this letter there was presented: First, what James had to say concerning trials from without; that God himself chasteneth His people for their discipline, and permits the devil and evil men to persecute

them in malice. He then tells them how to receive these trials; to count them a joy through discipline, and if they need wisdom, to ask God for it. But they must ask in faith, and they must have regard to the other laws of God. For instance, a man may ask and not receive because his object is to use what he asks for his own pleasure. The direction to go to God for this wisdom arises from the fact that there are two kinds of wisdom, one from above, first pure and then peaceable, and bringing forth the fruits of righteousness; the other earthly, sensual, devilish; that does not come from God. He then shows that these directions apply just as much to the rich man as to the poor man. His first point is that. Still speaking in review, he then takes up the same word, "temptation," but uses it in another sense. And concerning these temptations from within he shows that God is not the author of them—that God never entices any man to evil. He cannot do it on account of His nature, and He gives only good things and never evil things; that this enticement to evil may indeed come from the devil or from some other man, but when the sin is committed by the man the responsibility rests upon him. It is his act, no matter who entices—man or devil. This appears from the analysis of sin which he gives, that every man is tempted when he is drawn away by his own desire, and that desire when it has conceived bringeth forth sin and sin when it is full grown bringeth forth death. One of the finest points in the epistle is the fixing of the responsibility of the commission of sin upon man.

The next subject that he discusses is the Word of God, in its nature, as a seed implanted. In this letter James gives the offices of the Word of God. In its first office, it is a means of regeneration—"Begotten by the

Word." In its second office, it serves as a mirror. A man looking into a mirror discovers his own imperfections. The mirror faithfully presents himself to himself, just as he is. The Word of God is to be used as a mirror. Paul also uses the mirror illustration in another sense. Where and what?

In the next office of the Word, it is the perfect law of liberty, that is, it is the means through which, when properly observed, the slave to sin becomes a freeman to Jesus Christ. That perfect law of liberty is a great pulpit theme. There is a sermon on "The Perfect Law of Liberty" by a leading Methodist, Joshua Soule, who was bishop in the South when the division took place between the North and the South. It may be found in a book, "The Methodist Pulpit of the South," and it will jostle a young preacher to read it. No Baptist will accept all of it, but it is intensely interesting.

The Word of God is the means of regeneration, a mirror for convicting of sin and the perfect law of liberty. James then tells how this Word is communicated, and in that way he brings out its nature as of a seed implanted: "Receive ye the implanted Word of God." And then he asks how it is to be treated when it is received. Then he answers, "Forsake the evil which it condemns and do the good which it enjoins." Then he gives a loose, but very practical definition of practical religion in four strokes, two of them negatives: "If any man thinketh himself to be religious, while he bridleth not his tongue, but deceiveth his heart, this man's religion is vain." And then defines pure and undefiled religion with two strokes: He must keep himself unspotted from the world; he must visit the fatherless and the widows in their affliction. The reader will notice the ethical use of the phrase, "Pure and undefiled re-

ligion." Look up the etymological definition of religion. How is the word derived? It is a big word over the world. Here we recall the song:

"'Tis religion that can give sweetest pleasures while we live;
'Tis religion must supply solid comfort when we die."

QUESTIONS

1. Give the main points in the analysis of the first chapter.
2. How does James characterize himself in the salutation?
3. What is in this book about James that is astonishing?
4. How are trials from without to be received, and why? Illustrate by Job and Paul.
5. What illustration from the author's life?
6. What the meaning of the word, "perfect," in the N. T.?
7. Why the direction just here concerning wisdom?
8. Illustrate by the life of Solomon.
9. What the difference between wisdom and knowledge?
10. What the point of the case of the "inspired idiot?"
11. How obtain wisdom, and what the one essential in obtaining it? Compare our Lord's and Paul's teaching on this point.
12. What the two kinds of wisdom, and what the characteristics of each? Compare the Greek legend of Minerva and Milton's representation of sin.
13. What incentive to endure trials?
14. How may the foregoing directions be applied to rich and poor?
15. Whence come trials from within?
16. Why does not this enticement to sin come from God? From whom does it come, and what the proof?
17. What examples in the Letter, of James' power of analysis in tracing things to their fountain head?
18. What the complete order of his analysis of sin? Compare the cases of Eve and Achan, and also Milton's description of the relation of Satan, Sin and Death.
19. What is the Word of God as to its nature?
20. What are its offices according to James?
21. Compare James' use of the word, "mirror," with Paul's, and illustrate each.
22. What the N. T. idea of liberty, who the liberator, what the bondage from which delivered, how does the Word of God operate in securing liberty, and what the perfect law of liberty? Compare Ingersoll's lecture on it.
23. What is one of the finest points of this letter?
24. In four strokes give James' practical definition of religion.
25. What is the etymological definition of religion?

III

THE FAITH OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST

Scripture: James 2: 1-26

THE second chapter of James is a discussion of one theme. It is concerning the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ. James attempts no definition, either abstract or theological. But in an intensely practical way he shows the distinction between the true and the false faith in so many particulars that the chapter is a perfect mine of religious wealth. First, the true faith must be held without respect to persons. A man wants to know whether he has faith in Jesus Christ or not, and James gives him the practical side of it. Good and true faith in the Lord Jesus Christ must be without respect of persons. The man who has faith in Jesus must not, in the exercise of that faith, make a discrimination between people of high degree and low degree, between rich and poor people.

There is one plane of humanity and one plan of salvation, just as the eagle had to swoop down and fly into the door of the ark over whose portals the snail crawled.

There was not any top place for the eagle to come in. All who stand upon one plane of humanity are to be favored with absolute impartiality, and as Paul puts it, "In Christ there is neither male nor female, Barbarian, Scythian, Greek nor Jew." In other words, all distinctions based on race, nationality, tribe, property, wealth

—everything of that kind is lost sight of in the exercise of true faith in Jesus.

He gives some reasons why there must be no discrimination in the exercise of faith in favor of the rich as against the poor: "You observe that it is from the poor that God calls those who are richest in the faith, and that it is the rich that oppress you, and that if you make discrimination in favor of the rich, and you do that in the church when you meet, you dishonor the poor." This is the first test of faith. It must be without respect to persons.

Second, it must fulfill the royal law, *i. e.*, the words of the King of law: "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself." Paul says that love is the fulfilling of the law. James calls the law to love your neighbor as yourself the royal commandment—the king of all the commandments. Who first wrote, "Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself?" Who originated that?

The third test of faith is that it must be held without respect of commandments. This faith in Jesus Christ cannot go to God's commandments and pick out some of them and say, "I like these; I will keep them," and to others and say, "I do not like these; I will not keep them." He goes on to show the unity and solidarity of the law, and in that way proving that one must not have faith with respect to commandments; that the law is a unit; it is a solid thing, and that if a man is guilty of one thing he is guilty of all. A rope is no stronger than its weakest part, and a chain is no stronger than its weakest link. Suppose a man has stolen $500, and when he is brought into court he says, "I have not killed anybody." The fact that he had not killed anybody does not save him from any other part of the law. Therefore, James says that they must hold their faith with-

out any respect to commandments. In a sermon on this subject I ventured to quote an old English poet, who tells of those who

> "Compound for sins they are inclin'd to,
> By damning those they have no mind to."

Who was that English poet? Many people lay to themselves an unction of complacency by talking about the sins of other people: "Just look at that murderer, or that thief," while they may, though innocent of those particular offenses, be guilty of others just as bad.

A fair illustration of this is what I call "The New England Conscience." I call attention to some points upon which the New England conscience acted very strangely. Nearly all the writers from New England write about the purity of the New England conscience. It has always been a strange conscience to me. That conscience said, "For you to persecute us is sin. It is all right for us to persecute you." That conscience said, "The sin of the Southern slavery will not let us sleep, but our own sectional sins put us to sleep." That conscience said, "It was an awful thing for South Carolina to threaten only to nullify a Federal law, but it was patriotism for us to nullify many times, actually, a Federal law." That New England conscience says, "It is a sin for you people in England to persecute us, but if we whip Roger Williams and burn a few witches that is not sin." That conscience said, "Southern secession is treason, but it is patriotism for us to originate and teach the doctrine of secession as the best thing for ourselves." That conscience said, "It was treason for Beauregard to train his guns upon the Federal flag floating over Fort Sumter," and at the same time it canonized John Brown for pulling down the Federal flag. That conscience said, "It was a sin for the South to

disrupt the constitution," while they themselves said, "The constitution was a covenant with death and a league with hell." That conscience pilloried Gen. Early for burning one town, but it glorified Sheridan for burning all the homes in the Shenandoah Valley and Sherman for burning a section seventy miles wide from Atlanta to Savannah. That conscience said that it was a great sin for Federal soldiers to be ill-treated in the Civil War, but it was not pained at all at the ill treatment of the Southern soldiers. I doubt not that there are Southern sins of a like nature, for which we condemn Northern people.

James says that when one exercises faith he must exercise it without respect to commandments. He must not discriminate. One man says, "I am a believer in the Lord Jesus Christ, but I don't see any use in being baptized and joining the church." In other words, he says, "It is true that baptism means immersion, but why take a damp road to heaven, seeing that a few drops of water are just as efficacious as the ocean?" A soul that trusts in the Lord Jesus Christ will say, like Paul, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" And then say, "Whereupon, O King Agrippa, I was not disobedient to the heavenly vision." The word of Jesus Christ will be sufficient, and that is what James has to say upon that point.

Then he goes to the next point when he says that this faith must be fruit-bearing. A man may say, "I will show you my faith without my works." James says, "I show you my faith by my works." It must be evidenced to all by work. If a thing has life there must be some sign of that life: "Faith without works is barren." "Faith apart from works is dead." That is what James says. You may have a faith, but just as sure

as it never works it is not worth a snap of the finger. Then he gives an illustration in which he says, "If a brother or sister be naked and in lack of daily food, and one of you say unto them, Go in peace, be ye warmed and filled, and yet ye give them not the things needful to the body, what doth it profit?"

But the reader makes a great mistake if he supposes that James' teaching upon this subject is different from the teachings of the other N. T. writers, our Lord, for instance, or Paul, who is sometimes held up in opposition to James. Our Lord says, "Whosoever heareth these sayings of mine and doeth them not, shall be like a man who built his house upon the sand. When the storm came . . . that house fell, and great was the fall thereof," and it was our Lord who said, "If ye love me keep my commandments," and, "Ye are my friends if ye do whatsoever I command you," and it was Paul who said, "It is true, by grace ye are saved through faith and that not of yourselves. But ye are created unto good works." Then, in the Letter to Titus he says, "When the kindness and mercy of heaven to man appeared, not by works of righteousness that we have done, but according to His mercy He saved us by the washing of regeneration and the renewing of the Holy Spirit." And he goes right on to say this, that it is the grace of God that bringeth salvation; that we should live soberly and godly in this present world.

Both Christ and Paul agree with James that faith must evidence itself in good works. There never would have been any controversy at all if James had not used the word "justify" there in a peculiar sense, just like the word "temptation." "Justify" may be a legal, forensic term, a term of the court. We are justified by faith. That is the acquittal of God. But our Lord uses the

word "justify" in quite a different sense. He says, "By your words shall you be justified and by your words shall ye be condemned." So that James has in mind when he discusses justification by works, a thought that was not in the mind of Paul. Paul takes the case of a sinner and is trying to ascertain how that lost sinner can be declared just before God, and he says that it is through faith and apart from works. James takes a Christian, not a sinner, and shows how that Christian's works justify the Christian's profession. Just as our Lord said, "The publicans and harlots justified God." That does not mean that they acquitted God, but they vindicated God, being baptized with the baptism of John.

James uses a second illustration in the case of Abraham, who was justified by faith and received salvation, according to Genesis 15. That is when he was converted. It is true in a certain sense that he believed in God, but he was never a converted man until we find him in Genesis 15, that remarkable chapter that introduces so many words. There it is said that Abraham believed, and it is the first time that we come to the word. He believed Jehovah, and when he believed he was converted. Forty years after that, this believer, Abraham, did what God would have him to do in the case of Isaac, and the works justified him. Justified him in what sense? Not in a legal sense, but justified him in the sense of vindicating the profession of faith which he made. They did not make a sinner into a Christian, but justified the profession of the Christian.

I have never yet known a commentator nor a public speaker to give any evidence that he had noticed even this point that James now makes. He says that when forty years after Abraham's conversion that he did what God told him to do, that then was fulfilled the scripture,

which said, "And he believed on Jehovah and it was reckoned to him for righteousness." Every time afterward in his life that he obeyed God as a Christian he fulfilled the scripture which speaks of his conversion. In other words, it was the verification, "filled full," or "fulfilled." He says, bearing upon what was said forty years before, that it was imputed unto him for righteousness.

Many years ago Dr. J. B. Link was the editor of "The Texas Baptist Herald," and he wrote an essay for critical examination, taking this position: "The sinner is justified by faith; the Christian is justified by works." You see the position. I wrote a reply to the article at the time, conceding that a part of the idea in his mind was correct. A Christian makes a profession. That Christian is a servant of Jesus Christ; his fidelity to Christ must be attested. If he is faithful, he is declared righteous in his fidelity. In that secondary sense works justify, not in the sense of justifying a sinner in order to that sinner's becoming a Christian.

Precisely the same thing comes up in the case of Rahab. Her faith saved her. That saving faith was evidenced by works, corresponding to the profession, and these works justified the avowal of her faith, as in that passage in Timothy where Paul says Christ was justified by the Holy Spirit, *i. e.*, the Holy Spirit vindicated Christ, who claimed to be the Son of God. It seems somewhat curious to me that James and Paul and also the author of the Letter to the Hebrews, who was Paul—every one of them selected Rahab, the harlot, *i. e.*, who had been a harlot. The reason that she was selected is that she became an ancestress of the Lord, just like Ruth, the Gentile; just like Bathsheba, who had been the wife of Uriah, and afterwards the real wife of

David. All of these were the mothers, in the ancestral sense, of Jesus.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the theme of chapter 2?
2. What the marks of true faith?
3. What the reasons for not discriminating faith in favor of the rich against the poor?
4. What is the "royal law," and why so called?
5. Who originated it?
6. What is meant by the unity, or solidarity, of the law, and how does James show it?
7. What English poet said,

> "Compound for sins they are inclin'd to,
> By damning those they have no mind to?"

8. What modern discriminations are made in the commandments of Jesus?
9. What was Paul's attitude on this point?
10. What is meant by a dead faith?
11. What James' illustration of this kind of faith?
12. What the teaching of Jesus on this point?
13. What the teaching of Paul on the same point?
14. What one word used by James caused the controversy about his letter?
15. What its meaning as used by James? By Paul?
16. Illustrate.
17. Why was Rahab selected by James and Paul as an example of faith?

IV

TEACHERS AND TONGUES

Scripture: Jas. 3: 1-18

ALL of the third chapter of James is concerning teachers. It starts out this way: "Be not many of you teachers, my brethren, knowing that we shall receive heavier judgment." That is, don't be in a rush to crowd into the teacher's office, since the teacher is held to a more stringent account than the pupil. Dr. Broadus used to say that the ministry had a great attraction for weak minds. And it is certain that a great many weak minds do turn to the ministry. James merely wishes that the entering into the ministry should be a very careful, prayerful, thoughtful step. This chapter is one of the most important parts of the Book of James, and indeed the Bible, and its value is simply incalculable to young preachers. By their profession they become teachers of the Word of God; hence, no other chapter ought to be more important to them in their official character than this chapter. He then says, "If any stumbleth not in word, the same is a perfect man, able to bridle the whole body also." He is saying that the most difficult perfection to attain is perfection in talking; that it is harder to do right in talking than in anything else in the world. He uses three illustrations:

1. A bridle is put into a horse's mouth—a very little

thing—yet with that bridle one can guide that horse wherever he wants him to go.

2. He uses the helm of a big ship. The helmsman with that little instrument makes that ship go in the direction that he wants it to go.

3. "Behold, how much wood is kindled by how small a fire!" As it is expressed in the margin, "Behold, how great a forest of trees is consumed by a little fire!" Some one scampered along and carelessly left a fire. A spark blew out and caught the leaves and burned up a hundred million feet of wood-timber. In the northern states and Canada, every year we have the most appalling accounts of forest fires, and very richly the saying of James expresses the thought, "Behold, how great a forest a little fire will burn down!" J. R. Graves, in one of his flights of eloquence, describes a man walking down the street lighting a cigar and throwing the match down; the match set fire to a shaving which curled over on some other shavings, and they caught fire and burned, and set fire to a great pile of lumber; and that lumber to a house and that house to a block and that block to a city, and a conflagration came that painted hell on the sky and left a hundred thousand people without homes.

James says of teachers that when they rush into the teacher's office, they must remember the power of the tongue for good or evil, and that it must be controlled, as the horse must have the bridle, and the great ship the helm; and as the thoughtlessly kindled spark may destroy a world, so must they set a watch for the fire of their lips. In one of my opening addresses before the Seminary, I took as my theme, "Tongues of Fire and Rivers of Water."

But we come now to a part of James that is set over against Pentecost. Pentecost shows how the Holy Spirit

sets on fire the tongues of preachers to preach the salvation of men. Here James brings out the devil's tongues of fire—set on fire with tongues of demons. What a theme for a sermon—Pentecost-tongues and the devil's tongues! The tongue is a little member, it is a restless member, it is an unruly member, it is full of poison. It is set on fire of hell, and it sets on fire the whole course of nature, when it is kindled, just as the Holy Spirit fills the hearts of good men and gives them tongues of fire to proclaim the word of life in love and meekness, so the devil may kindle the tongues with a fire of hell, and use them as a means of universal ruin. Somebody, some day, will win immortal fame in contrasting the devil's tongues of fire and the Spirit's tongues of fire, in a sermon.

I recapitulate: The first admonition to the preachers: "Be not in haste to enter into the teacher's office." How well our Lord speaks to this point: "Be ye not called Rabbi; for one is your teacher and ye are all brethren. And call no man father on the earth; for one is your Father, even He who is in heaven. Neither be ye called masters (*majesta,* from which we get the word "master") for one is your master, even the Christ."

It was the characteristic fault of a Jew both at home and abroad to covet the honor of the teacher's office more than the efficiency in the service of a teacher. Vanity and conceit would lead men to thrust themselves forward where angels dared not tread. Whoever is inspired to enter the teacher's office from a spirit of vanity rather than the spirit of hard work is utterly unworthy of the position.

Paul, in Romans 2, says, "But if thou bearest the name of a Jew, and restest upon the law, and gloriest in God, and knowest His will, and approvest the things

that are excellent, being instructed out of the law, and art confident that thou thyself art a guide of the blind, a light of them that are in darkness, a corrector of the foolish, a teacher of babes, having in the law the form of knowledge and of the truth; thou therefore that teachest another, teachest thou not thyself? thou that preachest a man should not steal, dost thou steal? thou that sayest a man should not commit adultery, dost thou commit adultery? thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou rob temples? thou who gloriest in the law, through thy transgression of the law, dishonorest thou God?" The thought of Paul is that the life of the teacher must harmonize with what he teaches. Read Cowper on this.

Again, we are told by Paul in I Cor. 14:29, that the teaching gift must be exercised, even when possessed, with due discretion, looking always to order and never to confusion. His picture of the Corinthian church shows that there were many teachers in that congregation. He says, "What is it then, brethren? When ye come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation. Let all things be done unto edifying." He rebukes this church because of the disorderly method of teaching. Instead of convicting sinners, they produced an impression upon the mind of the ignorant man and of the skeptical man that they were crazy.

Again, Paul says that one who seeks the office of a bishop must be apt to teach. He must have the capacity to attract and hold the attention, to instruct the mind, to awaken the conscience, to lead the convicted sinner to Christ, to expound the Word of God, rightly dividing that Word. Unfortunately, the candidates for the teacher's office are not all apt to teach. The caution to these would-be teachers is on the line that vanity should not

be the cause of one entering the work of a teacher, seeing that he should not covet the honor more than the work itself, and that his life and his gifts must be exercised to the upbuilding of the church, and not confusion, and that unless he be apt to teach, he should not seek the position of a teacher. There are men with natural aptitude for teaching that are very ignorant. There are men full of information and a wide range of knowledge that cannot teach at all. They cannot impart what they know. They never wake up a soul, they never stir an audience, as Demosthenes did his audiences. When he got through, the crowd would be wild, and would say, "Let us fight Philip!"

His second admonition enjoins that the teacher must bridle his tongue. He gives two reasons for this governing of the tongue. He who can govern his tongue is a perfect man. I repeat that the word "perfect" is never used in the N. T. in the sense of sinlessness, but in the sense of maturity; and James certainly does not mean sinlessness, because he preceded his statement with the saying that we all stumble; that we all sin some. What he means by a "perfect" man is one who is mature; he who has bridled his tongue we call a mature man, just as a grown person is called an adult. His two reasons for bridling the tongue arise from its relative power for either good or evil. He uses the illustration to which attention has already been called. We put a bridle on a horse so as to turn his body wherever we may desire; so a bridle should be put on our own mouths. And as a helmsman steers a mighty ship in the storm through the use of the helm, so the one who would be a teacher must be able in every storm of life to have power of rightly directing his course, whatever be the direction of the wind or the force of the waves. He is led to

say in illustration of the power of the tongue, "How great a forest a little fire destroyeth!"

His illustration is familiar in the classics. A writer has well said, "A little torch can burn the summit of Ida." Homer says, "A spark scarce seen fires a boundless forest." Virgil tells us of a careless shepherd who "wraps the forest in a robe of flame" by his carelessness at his camp-fire. Edgar Allan Poe tells of one who in a dream was caught up and carried away by an angel until he saw a volcanic island without soil or fountains or vegetation, hideous with ashes, its lava and its scars. "What is this?" he said to the angel. The angel replied, "This is an evil word that you spoke in yonder world that went on acting and reacting until it struck the shores of eternity, and God crystalized it into this horrible volcanic island." The angel then carried the dreamer away to behold another island covered with verdure; the grass carpeted it, the flowers beautified it and filled it with perfume. Luscious fruits hung from the boughs of many trees. Birds were singing in the groves. Fountains were playing and sending forth living waters. It looked like a paradise of God. Said the dreamer to the angel, "What is this?" "This," said he, "is a good word you spoke in yonder world. It went on acting and reacting until, striking the shores of eternity, it was crystalized into this island of the blessed."

Another reason assigned for the teacher keeping his tongue consists in the fact that through the devil's gift men receive tongues of fire. As James expresses it, "Set on fire of Gehenna." We have seen the Spirit's display of power on the day of Pentecost, and these tongues are employed in speaking of the wonderful works of God in leading men to salvation. He declares that this tongue, set on fire of hell, is restless, duplex,

body-defiling, and that it sets on fire the whole wheel of nature. Man's control is vividly set forth by James. Everything that swims, that walks, that crawls, that flies, hath been tamed. The elephant has been trapped and trained and employed in man's service. The huge python has been brought from his home in the forest to become a show, and women take these hideous monsters and coil them around their bodies with impunity. The tiger's cub has been bound with a chain, and the lion has been caged and forced to be harmless and dumb in the presence of the trainer. It is a fearful commentary on the untamable nature of the tongue that it is more untamable than any wild animal of the jungle, or bird of the air, or serpent of the rock, or fish of the sea. When set on fire of hell, this tongue is said to be full of deadly poison. Indeed, it is declared to be a world of iniquity; that is, there is no evil ever known to man that has not in some instance been brought about through evil speaking.

Solomon declares that in the lips of the worthless man is a scorching fire. David, in denouncing the evil counsellor who sought his overthrow, says, "His mouth was smooth as butter, but his heart was war. His words were softer than oil, yet they were drawn swords." Again he prays, "Deliver me, great Jehovah, from lying lips and from a deceitful tongue. What shall be given unto thee, and what shall be done more unto thee, thou deceitful tongue, sharp arrows of the mighty coals of juniper?"

The tongues of the devil in malice curse men, made in the image of God. It becomes duplex, that is, it uses words to conceal ideas. This tongue, set on fire by the fires of hell, whispers away the good name of the innocent. It is given to backbiting, while friendly to the

face; it slanders when the man's back is turned. As the prophet says that the wicked in their talking eat up the sins of God's people, the tongue set on fire of the devil is always murmuring, always scolding and is always foul.

In an early day in the history of the Waco Association, Dr. Riddle and myself were visiting all the churches, and one night we were bound to camp, and while looking at the stars the conversation turned upon the conversation of preachers, and I proposed that we enter into a solemn covenant, never while we lived would we tell a questionable anecdote. In the course of time we got about one hundred preachers into that covenant. And when Dr. Riddle was dying he called his wife to him and said, "Wife, we have been together a long time and now I am leaving you. Now, when I am dead, don't you be one of those complaining women." Tears came into her eyes, at least a dozen times since the dying admonition of her husband, as she has explained to me why she was not a murmurer or a complainer.

The third admonition is that the teacher must seek true wisdom. And as the Spirit's tongues of fire had their opposite, the devil's tongues of fire, so the true wisdom has its opposite, the devil's wisdom. The contrast between the two kinds of wisdom is very sharp. One is from above and the other is earthly. One is full of mercy and good works without variance, without hypocrisy; the other sensual, carnal, devilish. The fruits are also contrasted. Peace is the fruit of one and strife of the other. This contrast between the two ought to be read whenever there is friction, evil speaking and strife.

When I was a young man I became impressed by the vast amount of trouble that comes from talking the wrong kind of talk, and I caught myself in talking the wrong thing, so when I read that chapter I determined

to see if I could find a way by which I could keep from evil speech, and, particularly, from anger. Naturally, I am impulsive, quick to take offense, quick to strike and quick to say, and seeing that fault in myself I determined to learn a way by which when I was angry I could be silent; that I wouldn't say anything. Well, it was the hardest thing to do that I ever tried. To be angry and not say anything! But I certainly accomplished it. I heard my daughter when she was twenty-one years old, say, "Papa, I have never heard you speak an angry word." That is the best way that I know to cure anger, that is, don't say anything. If a man just won't say anything he is safe, but he cannot when his mind is on fire with anger keep from doing wrong if he just lets his tongue be tied in the middle and wag at both ends.

Now, dear reader, try it. It will be a big job. When you have worked hard and are tired it is so easy to be petulant; it is easy to growl and whine, and it is so easy to become a man with a grievance. The world gets tired very soon of the man who has a grievance. Just carry your sorrow in your own heart.

There are great things in this for preachers. A man might steal from a man, might burn his house, but, if he burns a house, that burns out after a while, but if he says something, that goes on in every direction. I have known some lives blasted by gossip and slander just as a mighty forest fire blasts the vast trees.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the theme of chapter 3?
2. What is the first admonition concerning the teacher's office?
3. What Dr. Broadus' saying on this point?
4. What the special value of this chapter to preachers?
5. What is the most difficult perfection to attain?

6. What three illustrations used by James on this point?
7. What theme for a sermon suggested?
8. What the teaching of our Lord on the point of rushing into the teacher's office?
9. What the characteristic fault of the Jew?
10. What does Paul say about the teacher and his teaching?
11. What Paul's rebuke to the Corinthians on this line?
12. What qualification does Paul show that one must have who seeks the office of a bishop?
13. What his second admonition, and the application to teachers?
14. What the first reason why a teacher should guard his tongue?
15. Give classic illustrations of James' use of fire.
16. What Poe's illustration of the power of a spoken word?
17. What is the second reason of James why the teacher should keep his tongue?
18. What Solomon's testimony on this point?
19. What David's?
20. What are some of the things the devil's tongue can do?
21. What was the Carroll-Riddle covenant?
22. What the teacher's need of true wisdom?
23. Contrast the two kinds of wisdom, as to origin, elements and fruits.
24. What is the best way to cure anger?

V

GENERAL ADMONITIONS AND APPLICATIONS

Scripture: Jas. 4:1—5:20

WE will now examine the seventh general head of the analysis. Chapters 4 and 5 consist of general admonitions and applications. In chapter 4 we have five of these. First, he speaks concerning the swaying of the passions, and shows that inordinate lusts originate strife and nullify prayer. The Letter of James is remarkable for its analysis of human action. In tracing things to their fountain head, just as he traces sin in the abstract, so here he traces strife and faction in the concrete—that when we covet things contrary to God's law this lust leads us to make war upon all who oppose our selfish ends. The evil of yielding to these inordinate desires is manifested in the fact that a man's prayers are unanswered. He comes before God with his petitions, but God does not hear him. He is not seeking God's glory. He is not seeking God's will, but he is seeking that he may obtain things to be consumed upon his appetites, and on this account his prayers are unanswered.

In the next place James shows that friendship with the world is enmity to God. With all the clearness of our Lord himself, who taught that we cannot love God and mammon, he sets forth the fact that one who seeks the friendship of the world is guilty of spiritual adultery.

Spiritual adultery is idolatry. The soul has been espoused to Christ. To seek our greatest pleasure and happiness in the world is to be guilty of marital infidelity.

Just here we come upon two difficulties. In chapter 4:5 the common version reads, "Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?" The new version reads, "Or think ye that the scripture speaketh in vain? Doth the spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying?" The first difficulty is in finding the scripture which, according to the old version, James seems to quote. Commentators are unable to find any passage of scripture which reads, "The spirit which dwelleth in us lusteth to envy." Indeed, there is no such scripture. Then to what scripture does James refer? Some have supposed that he referred to a scripture showing that the friendship of the world is enmity with God. This could be obtained from Matthew's gospel, but that gospel was not yet written. And it is hardly probable that James has a back reference. We must look further on to find the scripture, and we do find it in the restatement at the close of the 6th verse: "Wherefore the scripture saith, God resisteth the proud, but giveth grace to the humble."

Our next difficulty on that verse consists in determining what spirit is meant when it says, "Doth the spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying?" In other words, does it refer to the Holy Spirit dwelling in the Christian, or does it refer to our own spirit? If we interpret it to mean our own spirit, then this is the idea: Those men whom James is rebuking were justifying their envyings and strife by charging it to God, since the envyings arose from the spirit which He made to dwell in them; that is, they were naturally so consti-

tuted that they could not help this envying. Hence, James would meet this statement by asking, "Does the spirit which He made to dwell in us long unto envying?" His form of question indicates a denial. Supported by his next statement, "But He giveth more grace;" that is, "suppose you say your envying comes from your corrupt soul; God did not corrupt your soul, and even though God did corrupt it, the corruption is your fault or Adam's fault; yet there is no justification for yielding to it, since He has promised grace with which to overcome this envying, and the grace is stronger than the depravity." If, however, we make the spirit that dwelleth in us mean the Holy Spirit, then the meaning must be this, according to the marginal rendering: That Spirit which He made to dwell in us yearns for us, even unto a jealous envy. This follows the idea that the Lord God is a jealous God; He will brook no rival. And if the soul commits adultery by seeking the friendship of the world, it provokes the jealousy of the Spirit which He made to dwell in us. While the passage is exceedingly difficult, my own impression is that the first meaning given is the better one.

We now come to some of the most important directions in the Word of God, from chapter 4:7-10, which reads as follows: "Be subject therefore unto God; but resist the devil, and he will flee from you. Draw nigh to God, and He will draw nigh to you. Cleanse your hands, ye sinners; and purify your hearts, ye double-minded. Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep: let your laughter be turned to mourning, and your joy to heaviness. Humble yourself in the sight of the Lord, and He shall exalt you." This expression gives the means by which we obtain control of our passions, and by which we resist the enticements of the world. This text

is twice expounded in the author's first book of sermons. It constitutes a marvelous theme for a revival meeting. It shows that we must be under one leader or the other—God or the devil. It not only calls upon us to resist the devil, but assures us that we have the power to resist him and turn him to flight. It is an exhortation to contrition, repentance and faith. The contrition is expressed by the words, "Be afflicted, and mourn, and weep. Humble yourself in the sight of God." The reformation following repentance is expressed by cleansing of the hands from sin and purifying the heart from double-mindedness; the faith is expressed by submission to God.

It is greatly to be feared that much of the preaching of modern times has lost its depth and power. The plow does not run deep enough. There is no deep conviction of sin. There is no mourning for sin such as we find set forth in Zechariah 13. We find our way to a modern profession of religion, dry-eyed. There is no weeping in it. And hence, feeling ourselves to be but little sinners, we need only a little Savior.

The next admonition relates to censoriousness—that spirit that continually judges another. Here James follows, as almost throughout the epistle, our Lord's great sermon on the Mount where he says, "Judge not, that ye be not judged. For with what judgment ye judge, ye shall be judged: it shall be measured unto you." The censorious spirit, says James, violates the law of God and usurps the divine prerogative of judgment. There is one Judge and one Law-maker.

From the evil of censoriousness he passes to consider the evil of the commercial spirit, a sin of which the Jews of the dispersion were pre-eminently guilty. It is true that their several captivities led to the deportation of many thousands of their people in different ages of the

world. But a mightier power than the Assyrians, mightier than Nebuchadnezzar, mightier than Pompey, deported the Jews from their own land, and this was the spirit of trade. Cut off from the great honors of a free national government, all of their energies were turned to money making. Their merchant-ships were on every sea; their peddlers in every land. As they were then, so they are now. James does not condemn commerce. They presumed on the uncertainty of the future and ignored God. Without counting on the brevity of human life and their ignorance of what a day might bring forth, without considering the providence of God, the Jew, incited by his love of trade, would say in mapping out his plans, "To-morrow we will go into this city, and spend a year there, and trade and get gain." James said they should have said, "If the Lord will, we shall both live, and do this or that." His teaching harmonizes with the old proverb, "Man proposes, but God disposes." The recklessness evinced by the Jews of the dispersion in yielding to a commercial spirit which took no account of time or the brevity of life or of the government of God, in less degree characterizes the traders of the Gentile world to-day. Men leave God out of their calculations. Men consider not their own frailty or the uncertainties of life.

Chapter 5 also is devoted to five applications of these admonitions. The first is a denunciation of the rich. Of course he means the Godless rich, and what he says is more needed now than when he said it. He sees the miseries of the rich coming upon them. They accumulate more wealth than they can use, and hence it becomes corrupt. In their strenuous desire to become wealthy, they disregarded the rights of their employees. The men whose money made their wealth are treated as

machines or as dumb brutes. The cry of the toilers goes up to the Lord of hosts, just as the Israelites in bondage in Egypt cried out and God heard their cry and came down to intervene. They are warned that they are sapping their virility by delicate living, and that in their greed to amass fortunes, they have not hesitated to kill the righteous. The pages of modern magazines and newspapers are ablaze with denunciations of millionaires and syndicates and their measures. Political parties are aligning themselves upon the issues raised between the rich and their employees, or between the rich men and the people who have been robbed by their methods of trade.

The general theme of this letter is patient endurance of affliction. In chapter 5:12 we have this language: "But above all things, my brethren, swear not, neither by the heaven, nor by the earth, nor by any other oath: but let your yea be yea, and your nay be nay; that you fall not under judgment." James is not talking at all about oaths that one takes in a court room, nor oaths unto God, but he is discussing the question of the outlet of our emotions when we are in great trouble or great joy. He says that if we are in great trouble, we should not swear. Notice how common it is for men who are afflicted to curse. And in the same way some people, when they are very happy, give an outlet to their emotions in swearing. The thought of James is this: In the deep emotions which come to a human being in the vicissitudes of his life, never let swearing be the outlet.

Then he goes on to tell what shall be the outlet. He says, "If any of you are suffering, don't swear, but pray. Let prayer be the outlet." Again, if filled with great joy; if the heart is bubbling over with happiness, how may one keep from making a mistake in the outlet of

these emotions? James says in that case, "Sing Psalms."

We will be sure to misinterpret this letter unless we understand what his object is. The object is to show both negatively and positively what outlet shall be given to the emotions when one is greatly stirred up, either from afflictions or joy. Just at the point of great suffering or great joy comes a danger. What are you going to say? Are you going to swear or pray or sing Psalms?

James now comes to a case of sickness. "Is any among you sick? Let him call for the elders of the church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord: and the prayer of faith shall save him that is sick, and the Lord shall raise him up; and if he have committed sins, it shall be forgiven him."

The first thought in connection with the scripture is the word, "elders." Carefully note these scriptures: Acts 11:30, which precedes in time James' letter; Acts 14:23, 15:2, 4, 6, 22; 16:4; 21:18. No one can read these passages about the elders without noting that there is a distinction between a layman and an elder—that the latter has an office—that he occupies a representative position. In the pastoral epistles there are many references to elders, and the term elder, (Greek, *presbuteros,*) is used interchangeably with *episkopos,* bishop or pastor, showing that an elder was a preacher. The only difference I see between the N. T. churches and the Baptist churches of the present time upon that subject is that at the present time Baptist churches pay no sort of regard to any sort of elder in their church unless he is their pastor. In the N. T. churches the preachers of the church, those who had been set apart as God's ministers, though only one of them could be pastor of the flock, yet every one of the others was treated as an officer of

the church of Jesus Christ and entitled to consideration. In Acts 11 when Paul and the bishops took that collection to Jerusalem, they turned it over to the elders. If a man is sick let him send for the elders of the church. Good commentators see in that direction that when the elders respond to that invitation they come in a representative capacity. It is as if the church had been assembled to pray for the sick man. The preachers come together and pray in the name of the church.

The next thing is, What do they do? This scripture says, "Let them anoint him with oil in the name of the Lord." We come to this question, Was that oil to be used for medicinal purposes, as Dr. Eaton says in "The Recorder," and as Dr. Winkler says in his "Commentary on the Book of James?" (A part of the "American Commentary," and withal about the best commentary on James that I know.)

I cannot agree with these brethren. I don't think that oil was used as a medicine. I think if there had been a desire to secure medical help, James would have said, "Send for the doctor." But he says, "Send for the elders of the church and let them anoint him with oil." Another reason why I don't think oil was put upon the sick man for medicinal purposes is that while oil is a splendid remedy for some sickness, it is no remedy for a good many others. It is a good medicine when a man has a fever. The third reason is that it was not the oil that procured the recovery from sickness. It distinctly says that the prayer of faith and not the oil shall heal the man. It seems clear to my mind, then, that the anointing with oil was not to make doctors out of preachers.

Then it must have been used symbolically. A holy anointing of oil was poured upon the heads of kings,

prophets and priests, and this oil signified the influence of the Holy Spirit. Jesus Christ is the Anointed One. He is not anointed with the symbolic oil, but with what the oil symbolizes. I think, then, that the use of the oil was symbolic of the accompanying power of the Holy Spirit, just as the laying on of the hands in ordination is a symbolic act. It symbolizes the descent of the Holy Spirit on the man ordained, to qualify him for preaching.

Here is another question: Is James giving a direction for all times? In other words, is that direction binding upon us now? Or was it simply carrying out what is expressed in Mark 6:13? When Jesus sent out the twelve apostles and told them to heal the sick, cast out demons, the record says (Mark 6:10), "They anointed with oil many that were sick, and healed them." That is to say, it was in the apostolic days a miraculous, divine attestation of those who employed it. And James is living and writing in the days of the apostles. He is the earliest of the N. T. writers. At that time the apostles were still living and had that commission of our Lord to anoint with oil and heal the sick, and that commission through the apostles comes to the church.

My own judgment is that James speaks of the miraculous attestation of the church, and when the attesting was complete, the sign ended.

I have never felt that an obligation rested upon me as a preacher to go to the sick and anoint them with oil in the name of the Lord in the expectation that they should be miraculously healed.

There are some good brethren who believe that this injunction was meant for all time, and so all along through the ages there have been those that held that the right thing to do with the sick was to send for the preachers and let the preachers carry out this injunction. I

have never carried out the injunction because I did not believe the injunction rested on me. It is evident that this method of healing, a miraculous method, even in the days of the apostles, was not a constant thing. It was simply a sign occasionally used.

For instance, Paul says, "I left Trophimus at Miletus sick." Why did not he anoint him with oil and raise him up, if this was the standing order? To Timothy, who was in feeble health, he prescribes wine, not oil. Timothy was a tee-totaler and did not believe he ought to touch ardent drinks. Paul says in this particular case, "Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake." Why did not he tell them to anoint Timothy with oil? Paul had a thorn in his own flesh, but he did not send for the elders of the church to come and anoint him with oil.

My point is that these were directions of attestation, a marvelous manifestation of the miraculous power of the Spirit of God for specific purposes, just as tongues were for a sign. But tongues were to cease, and miracles were to cease, and prophecies were to fail just as soon as they accomplished their object. That is what James refers to here.

But one may ask me if at the present time I pray for sick people to get well. I say, "Yes." Prayer is to be kept up; prayer never ceases. The anointing with oil that was a symbol of the miraculous power may cease, but the praying does not cease, and I pray for sick people that if it be God's will they may get well. In some instances they do get well, but in some instances it is not God's will that they should get well, so they die. When a man is invited to pray for the recovery of a sick person he ought to do it, and he ought when he prays to submit the disposition of the matter to the will of God, otherwise, it would mean that if a little band of

praying people got together it would stop death over the world, which was not the purpose of God. We cannot escape death.

The Roman Catholic Church establishes upon this passage of James what they call the sacrament of "extreme unction," one of the seven sacraments. When a Catholic is given up by his physicians, and he is in *articulo mortis,* they anoint him, and on account of his dying state they call it extreme unction—the last anointing. The trouble about getting that from this passage is that James prescribes a duty for recovery. *They* appoint a sacrament for the dying. The Romanist also tells us how that oil is to be made—that it is valueless unless the bishop makes it and the priest anoints.

The Roman Catholic was at one time the state religion of England and continued so until the time of Henry VIII, and the Episcopalians retained in their ritual a great many things that had been handed down to them through the Romanists. Here is what their prayer book says must be done when a man is about to die. It is in the first prayer book of Edward VI: "If the sick person desires to be anointed, then shall the priest anoint him upon the forehead or breast only, making the sign of the cross, saying, 'As with this oil I anoint thee, may Almighty God grant of His infinite goodness that thy soul inwardly may be anointed with the Holy Ghost who is the spirit of all strength from relief and sickness, and vouchsafe from His great mercy, if it be His perfect will to restore unto thee bodily health and strength to serve him.'" There is no harm in the prayer itself.

From the particular case James enlarges: "Confess therefore your sins one to another, and pray one for another, that ye may be healed." This extends beyond elders. The confession of sins is a doctrine of both the

Old and the New Testament. John the Baptist would not baptize a man who did not confess his sins. He baptized them in the river Jordan, confessing their sins. John says, "If we confess our sins, He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins."

A question here arises about the confession, and on that is a great deal of remarkable history in the annals of the so-called churches. They have gotten themselves into a good deal of trouble on it. Some of them used to take the position that a man was under obligation to get up and confess every sin publicly that he had been guilty of since the church met before. Then they fell upon the method that the confession should indeed be made, but it should be made privately and let the preacher advise whether it should be made public. They tried that until one preacher made a public announcement of sin confessed without the consent of the man who confessed to him, and that created such a fury that they stopped it.

What James means is this: If I do wrong to a brother I must confess to him my wrong. If he wrongs me, he confesses that wrong to me. If I have sinned against God, I must confess that sin to God. The confession, then, must be made to the one who has been wronged. Sometimes a man wrongs the church, that is to say, he is guilty of such open, public, outrageous sin, like drunkenness, that a confession is due to the church and he must confess to the church in such a case. But suppose I have only had wrong thoughts in my mind, must I confess to the church? No, I should confess that to God. Go right along and confess that wrong fully to Him, but not to the world.

Upon what James has said about confession the Romanists have another doctrine called "auricular con-

fession," or a confession in the ear. Every priest has a certain station in the church building, with a little bit of a window. He is shut up on the inside and puts his ear to that opening, and each member of the congregation is compelled once every year at least to come and whisper into the ear of the priest every sin he has committed. In that way they get possession of the secrets of the world. They know all the skeletons in every family. It becomes a tremendous power in their hands.

They connect this doctrine with penance. When a lady leans over and tells what sins she is guilty of, he prescribes a penance: "You must recite so many Ave Maria's. You must fast so many days. You must pay so much money." When the penance is performed, then they have their doctrine of absolution. The priest absolves from sin the one who has confessed and done penance. There is not one thing in this passage to warrant auricular confession with its attendant usages. In the time of the Protestant Revolution the Council of Trent passed a decree to this effect: "Let anyone be anathematized who denies that sacramental confession was instituted of divine right, or who denies that it is necessary to salvation, or who says that the manner of confession to the priest alone, which the church has observed from the beginning and doth still observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ and is a human invention." So they make it essential to salvation.

Many a time have persons come to me and started to tell things. I say, "Stop; hold on, I am no priest. I don't know what you are going to tell me. It may be something you ought not to tell me. If it is absolutely essential to right advice that I know, you may tell me, but you must carefully think over in your mind before

you make that confession." Three times in my life I have had jarring, startling confessions made to me. It would beat a novel if I were to tell what they were, but I will not. I say to the one who is in trouble, if you have sinned against God, go and confess to God. If you have sinned against your neighbor, go and confess to your neighbor; but I am sure that because I am a preacher, I cannot be made the receptacle of every slimy thought that ever crawled through the minds of the people where I live, and of every evil imagination. I would rather be dead than have to listen to such things. But sometimes I have to let them tell me to get them out of the ditch they are in.

James then cities the case of the power of Elijah's praying, and lest anyone might say that Elijah was a prophet, he goes on to state that Elijah was a man of like passions with us and he prayed that it might not rain and it rained not; and he prayed that it might rain and it did rain. That brings up the question whether it is the proper thing now to pray for rain.

I say, "Yes, pray for anything." There is nothing in the world that man needs either in body or soul that should be excluded from the petition.

I never shall forget a statement made by Dr. Ford when he returned from England, having visited Mr. Müller, called "the man of faith." When he got to the place he was very anxious to see the most remarkable man of faith living in the world, but Mr. Müller had gone away and had not returned. They were all assembled, and it was a time of horrible drouth. Dr. Ford himself had been choked with dust in getting to the place where they had called all the people together to pray for rain. About that time Mr. Müller himself walked in, covered with dust. One of the deacons got

up and said, "Mr. Müller, we are distressed about the drouth, and we thought we ought to take it to the Lord. Is it right to pray for rain?" And he said, "Yes, let us pray." Then he stood up and prayed just like a little child: "Oh Lord, look at the dumb brutes, lowing for water and perishing. See the travelers choked with the dust on the thoroughfares. See the people's crops and gardens impoverished; Lord God, send rain to thy people." And before they were dismissed the rain came that flooded all that section of the country. Dr. Ford in telling about it said the most impressive thing he ever witnessed in his life was Mr. Müller's child-like manner and the faith with which he took hold of the promises of God.

The scientists say that to pray for rain is an attempt to change the laws of nature. Not a bit of it. Why, then, pray for anything else? The scientists say that the way to get wisdom is to study for it. There is not anything that we can pray for at all if we let that argument hold.

We now reach the last thing in the book: "My brethren, if any among you err from the truth." James does not mean if he goes astray in doctrine. James does not discuss doctrine. To err from the truth with James was to go astray in practical religion from God. "And one convert him, let him know that he who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." What is the signification of "cover a multitude of sins?" Then, whose sins? The Romanist says it is the sins of the man who does the converting, as if to say, "Now if you want to accumulate a fund of righteousness that will be to your account by which you may be justified on the last great day, convert some one else from the error of

his way and thus cover your sins." That is the thought and that is the doctrine involved in it, but that was not the thought of James. It is not the converter's sin that will be covered, for nothing is said about his sins, but it is the sins of the one to be converted that is to be covered.

Then, what does "cover" mean? There is a proverbial expression that charity covereth a multitude of sins. It is so used in the book of Proverbs. It is so used in the letter of Peter. That is to say, "Love is not consoriousness." It does not look for specks and spots and deficiencies, and when it sees faults, it is more apt to put the mantle of charity over them than to unveil them. Does this mean that kind of covering of sin? I will tell you why I don't think so. "He who converteth a sinner from the error of his way shall save a soul from death, and shall cover a multitude of sins." It is his salvation that is accomplished. Here is a sinner who has erred in his life and has gone away from the law of God. He is one whose steps take hold of death and hell, and we are exhorted to try to save him by prayer, by faithful admonitions, by preaching to him the means of salvation, and then encouragement is given us that if we do become the means of his salvation, we have saved a soul from death and covered a multitude of sins. What does that "cover" mean? In Psalm 32 David says, "Blessed is the man whose sin is covered. Unto him the Lord imputeth not iniquity." There the covering gets its idea from the mercy seat, that the sin is counted covered which by faith has been placed in Jesus Christ and forgiveness comes. Paul quotes David: "Blessed is the man whose sin is covered," and shows that it means justification, forgiveness of sins.

QUESTIONS

1. Of what do chapters 4 and 5 consist?
2. How many in the fourth chapter?
3. What is the first one, and its relation to prayer?
4. How does James characterize the friendship of the world?
5. What the two difficulties of 4:5, and what their solution?
6. What is taught in 4:7-10?
7. What apprehension about modern preaching?
8. What admonitions on censoriousness, where is found the same teaching of our Lord, and in what does the sin consist?
9. What was the sin of which the Jews of the dispersion were pre-eminently guilty?
10. How did this sin cause their dispersion, and in what did it consist?
11. What prescription was given by James for those possessed with this spirit?
12. What is James' attitude toward the problems of "capital and labor?"
13. What the general theme of this letter?
14. What does James mean, both negatively and positively, by "swear not at all?"
15. What prescription does he give for the outlet of sorrow or joy?
16. What the distinction between elder and pastor, and what capacity of the elder here referred to?
17. Was the anointing-oil, here to be used, a medicine? Give three reasons for your answer.
18. What then the use made of the oil?
19. Does James give a direction for all times? If not, then explain and give proof.
20. Is it right to pray for the sick? If so, how?
21. What "sacrament" of the Catholic church based upon this passage?
22. What the fallacy of this Romanist position?
23. What does James say about confession, what remarkable history connected with it, and what the real meaning of the passage?
24. What institution of the Catholics based upon this passage, and what its evils?
25. Is it right to pray for rain? Illustrate.
26. In 5:19 what is meant by "err from the truth?"
27. In 5:20 whose sins are referred to?
28. What is meant by "cover a multitude of sins?"

THE BOOK OF FIRST THESSALONIANS

VI

INTRODUCTION

WE shall now consider "the apostolic letters which made glad the young and foe-girt churches of the Lord." These letters of Paul constitute the richest legacy of inspiration and inestimable treasure—a sacred deposit of truth. The Apostle Paul is connected directly with fourteen of the N. T. books and indirectly with four others, making eighteen in all. So that one may get a connected N. T. spirit of Paul by reading in the following order these eighteen books of the New Testament:

1. Luke, which is called the Pauline Gospel.
2. Acts.
3. I and II Thessalonians.
4. I and II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans.
5. Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews.
6. I Timothy, Titus, II Timothy.
7. James.
8. II Peter.

The letters of Paul are divided into four groups. The first group was written on his second great missionary tour, and consists of I and II Thessalonians. The second group was written on his third great missionary tour, consisting of I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Romans. The third group consists of letters written when he was

first a prisoner at Rome, viz.: Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews. The fourth group consists of letters written after his release from the first captivity at Rome, viz.: I Timothy, Titus and II Timothy. These were written in the interval between his first and second imprisonments, and at Rome during his second captivity just before his martyrdom.

These groups differ from each other very much in the doctrinal matters discussed, and in style. The first group, I and II Thessalonians, discusses mainly what in theology is called Eschatology—the doctrine of the last things. The whole of these two letters is grouped around the doctrine of the second coming of Christ. The clearest teachings on the second coming of Christ are in I and II Thessalonians. There are other places where the doctrine is taught, particularly in our Lord's great prophecy, I Corinthians 15 and II Peter 3, but these letters were written specifically upon that subject.

The next group of letters, I and II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans, was called forth mainly by the controversy between the Judaizing spirit in the churches, which would make Christianity a mere sect of the Jews, and the Pauline spirit in the churches, which would lead the churches away from the narrow Jewish limitations into a world-wide religion. In the third group, his doctrine goes to higher things, the controversy not being on making Gentiles become Jews in order to be Christians, but shall Christians reject Christ and His Gospel and relapse into Judaism?

Before commencing the study of Paul's letters it is well to fix the following things in our minds about him:

1. His history from his birth to his conversion, that is, up to the time that he is 33 or 34 years old.

2. That nine years of his life from his conversion

until he entered on his great missionary work. Three years of this period were devoted to the preparation in receiving the gospel and six years in preaching at Damascus, at Jerusalem, in Cilicia and in Syria. There is very little history about that nine years in the Bible.

3. The period of active missionary labor, about fifteen years, covering the three great missionary tours described in Acts 13-21, and in which he wrote the letters to the Thessalonians, Corinthians, Galatians and Romans.

4. The period of his imprisonment at Jerusalem, at Cæsarea, on his voyage to Rome, and in Rome. In that time he wrote five great letters—Philippians, Philemon, Colossians, Ephesians and Hebrews. We have very little account of this part of his life.

5. The period of his release from captivity, in which he wrote I Timothy and Titus. We gather the history of this period from his pastoral letters.

6. The period of his second captivity at Rome and his martyrdom. In this period he wrote II Timothy. In the Acts we see Paul as he appears to the historian, Luke. In his letters we see him as he appeared to himself. These letters constitute a literature in themselves, of great variety in matter and style. Some of them, like Galatians, are a rushing, impetuous torrent; others, like Romans, Ephesians and Hebrews, are calm, deliberate, logical, approaching the form of an elaborate treatise; some are personal and exquisitely tender, as Philemon; some are developments of the main thought in previous and more local letters, as Romans from Galatians, Ephesians from Colossians and Philippians, and all of them matchless, each of its kind.

In commencing this great series with I Thessalonians, we should fix in our minds the geographical place of the city, Thessalonica, and somewhat of its history. On the

second great missionary journey Paul came to Troas, starting from Antioch. There he received a call to go into Macedonia and help the people there. At Philippi a church was established. That is the first place where he preached the gospel in Europe. There he strikes the Roman road which extends from Constantinople, or Byzantium, to Rome. That was one of the best worked roads in the world. It connected Rome, the Western empire, with Constantinople, the Eastern empire. When Paul left Philippi, he came to Thessalonica, passing two places on the way without stopping. The geographical position of that place in every age of history has been reckoned as very important, not only because it was on that great road, but because it was at the head of the commerce of the Ægean Sea, connecting with the Mediterranean Sea, and also because it commands the passes between the high mountains.

Every Bible student ought to know something about Thessalonica before Paul came there. Away back in Grecian history the name was Therma, or Hot Springs, just like Hot Springs, Ark. Three hundred and fifteen years before Christ, just after Alexander the Great died, Cassander, one of his generals, married Thessalonica, and made that Hot Springs a great city and named it after his wife, Thessalonica. She was the daughter of King Philip of Macedon, and the sister of Alexander the Great. It became a very populous and very important city. About 168 B.C. Macedonia was conquered by Rome and divided into four districts, and the capital of one of these districts was Thessalonica. Afterwards the districts were abolished, and they had just one province, and Thessalonica was the capital of that province. About A. D. 42, just after the great battle at Philippi between Octavius Cæsar and Mark Antony on the one side, and

Brutus and Cassius on the other side, Thessalonica was made a free city. Strabo, the great geographer of the age about B. C. 24, said that Thessalonica was the most populous town in Macedonia, and the same thing was said in the second century after Christ, and in the fifth century after Christ it had 200,000 inhabitants. There are about 100,000 people there now. It is today the second city in importance in what is called Turkey in Europe, and the third in population. About a third of these people are Jews. Up to a short time ago three great cathedrals were there, built by Christians, but they have passed into the hands of Mohammedans and become mosques. Something over twenty years ago the chief one of these cathedrals, the Mosque of St. Sofia, was destroyed by fire, to the regret of the whole world on account of its magnificence and of marvelous relics of ancient times kept there.

This city was captured by the Saracens, or Mohammedans, in A. D. 934, after a long and desperate siege. These Saracens held it until A. D. 1185, when the Crusaders recaptured it. There are some marvelous things in the history of these two sieges. The Crusaders held it until 1430, not far from the time that Columbus discovered America, when the Turks captured it, and have held it ever since.

It was a favorite stopping place of Cicero. Some of his most famous letters were written from Thessalonica. He was there with Pompey's army just before that army was defeated at the battle of Pharsalus. It is interesting to compare those letters of Cicero, written from Thessalonica, with those two letters that Paul wrote to the people of Thessalonica not more than a hundred years later. (See introduction to Thessalonians in Cambridge Bible.)

The church established by Paul at Thessalonica, with all of its subsequent development down to the present time, has been a very famous theme in church history. It got the reputation of being called the orthodox city, and it became the center of the wonderful missionary activity when the Goths and the Slavs invaded that country. These Christian people determined to convert them, and Thessalonica headed the great missionary movement. It now affiliates with the Greek Catholic Church and has done so for many hundred years. A Greek Catholic Archbishop lives there, and most of them haven't much religion. This is a brief account of that place before and after the Apostle Paul touched it.

But let us see how Christianity reached Thessalonica. Turn to Acts 17 and read carefully the first nine verses which give the historical account of the establishment of the church at Thessalonica by Paul, Silas and Timothy: "Now when they had passed through Amphipolis and Apollonia, they came to Thessalonica, where was a synagogue of the Jews." They always liked to commence their preaching at a synagoguge because they felt they ought to first lead the Jews to Christ, and second, because grouped around the synagoguge was always a large class of Gentiles who had been proselyted with different degrees of proselytism to the Jews. There were quite a number of them in Thessalonica who had become disgusted with the idolatry of the heathen and were attracted by the pure monotheism of the Jews. The gospel was received more readily by Jewish proselytes than by any other class. Then the synagogue gave them a house in which to preach, as well as a congregation, until the line had to be sharply drawn. "And Paul, as his custom was, went in unto them, and for three Sabbath days

[He met them on their own Sabbath days] reasoned with them from the scriptures." In their synagogue, on their Sabbath day, out of their Holy Book he reasoned with them.

Let us see what he talked about: "Opening and alleging that it behooved the Christ to suffer." He showed that the O. T. books taught that the Messiah must die, plainly as prophesied by Isaiah in the 53rd chapter, or typically, as in the sacrifices which foreshadowed His vicarious expiation. It was a hard thing to convince a Jew that when his Messiah came He must die. Then Paul had to prove his second position: "This Jesus whom I proclaim unto you is your Messiah." You see what a logician Paul was, and how tactful: "I will come to your house. I will come to your day of worship. I will take your own books and let them be my text-books, and prove from these O. T. scriptures that the Messiah set forth in them was to die and rise again the third day. That is my first proposition. Then I will prove to you that Jesus of Nazareth, whom I preached unto you, is that Messiah."

That lasted three Sabbath days. Let us see with what result: "And some of them were persuaded, and consorted with Paul and Silas; and of the devout Greeks a great multitude [They always came in more readily], and of the chief women not a few." Notice how the gospel reaches women. See how it reached Lydia back yonder at the place for a prayer-meeting in Philippi, where they did not have a synagogue. Notice how it reached them under the preaching of Christ. Imagine those chief Greek ladies in that city, those that thought and had hearts, and consciences, seeing the shameful degradation of woman under the heathen idolatries, how intently they listened to a religion that exalts woman,

lifts her from slavery, makes her the companion and equal of man and the subject of divine grace.

"But the Jews [here we come to the struggle], being moved with jealousy, took unto them certain vile fellows of the rabble." We have them in every city, called the "riff-raff—toughs." What a mean thing it was to conspire with that kind of a crowd to raise a mob against those preachers! Yet, I have known similar things to be done. "And gathering a crowd, set all the city in an uproar; and assaulting the house of Jason, they sought to bring them forth to the people. And when they found them not, they dragged Jason and certain brethren before the rulers of the city, crying, These that have turned the world upside down have come hither also."

This is the accusation—that they were revolutionary; that they were guilty of treason against Cæsar, since they set up another king, one Jesus. Precisely the same charges were brought against Christ—treason and sedition. "And they troubled the multitude and the rulers of the city, when they heard these things." Those Roman judges, however, were not very easily led aside to do a wrong thing. In jurisprudence, the Romans were the most just of all the governments of the ancient world. So they took security. Far back goes the custom of putting a man under bond: "And when they had taken security from Jason and the rest, they let them go." That is the history in the Acts.

The first and second letters to the Thessalonians bring out many details of that work that Luke in his account in the Acts does not give. Let us see what Paul preached while he was there. First, as I have shown, he preached to the Jews, showing that the O. T. Messiah must suffer and die and rise again from the dead, and that Jesus was that Messiah. Then he set forth the purpose of

that death. That was to the Jews. When they spoke to the Gentiles they told forth the falsity and the wickedness of idolatry. We learn that many of them turned from their idols and served the true and living God. They preached the glorious kingdom of God, and Jesus Christ the King. Here was one world empire, Rome. They preached another world empire and Jesus Christ as the King. And particularly did he emphasize that Jesus, who died, rose again and ascended to heaven, will come a second time to judge the world in righteousness. I will show how this matter is brought out. The first chapter and the tenth verse says, "And to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, *even* Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come."

Take 2:19: "For what is our hope, or joy, or crown of glorying? Are not even ye, before our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming?" Take 3:13: "To the end He may establish your hearts unblamable in holiness before our God and Father, at the coming of our Lord Jesus with all His saints." Take 4:14-18; it is all about the second coming of Christ. Take 5:23: "And the God of peace himself sanctify you wholly; and may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." I have given you a passage in each chapter of that letter bearing upon the second coming of Christ. We will discuss these things more particularly when we go to discuss the letter itself. I am showing you what he preached at Thessalonica.

The doctrines that he preached were closely followed by moral applications. The morals of the poor people among the heathen were awful, and the upper classes were worse than they. Paul preached to them that they must be pure in life. The worship of their idols was

accompanied with debasing forms of adultery and fornication. These people of Thessalonica were not half as moral in their lives as the lowest and most ignorant of the Negroes here in this country, with their crude ideas of the sanctity of marriage and the purity of life. Paul emphasized the doctrine of purity. Then he emphasized the doctrine of loving the brethren and, particularly, he struck them a hard blow on honest self-support. The streets of those old cities then were filled with idlers and loafers, hanging around and begging. If we were to walk through the streets of Thessalonica to-day, we would need a guard to keep off the professional beggars. Paul laid down the unwelcome proposition that professors of faith in the Lord Jesus Christ who would not work, should not eat. What a wonderful doctrine for the time and place! What a reforming power it must have been with that kind of a population! It is a pity that the great cities of the Latin race and of the Orient do not now have the doctrine that a grown man who hangs around in rags and begs, without visible means of support, is not entitled to respect and ought not to be allowed to eat. It was on this account that he himself worked night and day to support himself. He wanted to give them an example. He writes to them and tells them that he had a right to demand a support from them, but he did not exact his right. He wanted to uphold the dignity and majesty and honor of good, honest, hard work. We ought not to have any respect for a religion that makes idlers now.

That is what he preached, and the results we have already seen: a few Jews, a great many proselytes, including the most honorable women in the city, were converted, and as soon as the line was drawn the Jews began to persecute, and he told them when he came

back with his sores from stripes received at Philippi that there was nothing ahead of him but death, bonds and imprisonment. He told these poor people, and reminded them of the fact that he had told them before, that they who follow Christ must suffer persecution. It was no easy path that he pointed out to them.

Now, compelled to leave there under the circumstances of that persecution, we want to know how long it was before he wrote this letter. Luke tells us that he went from there to Berea. He left that big road and went off to the quiet country. He stayed there until the Jews at Thessalonica followed him and raised a persecution against him. Then he left Berea and they took him to Athens. There he preached, and from Athens he went to Corinth. From Athens he sent Timothy back to Thessalonica to find out how these people were getting along, and so we learn in Acts 18:5 that Timothy rejoined him at Corinth, and we learn from I Thess. 3:6, his first letter, the same thing: "But when Timothy came even now unto us from you, and brought us glad tidings of your faith and love, and that ye have good remembrance of us always, longing to see us, even as we also to see you." There is the occasion of the letter. Who wrote it? Paul. Where? At Corinth. When? About five or six months after he left Thessalonica.

What is the character, or style, of this letter as a piece of composition? Everybody is glad that it is not a logical treatise; that it is not a sermon. Everybody is glad that it is a letter from the heart, just as if he were speaking face to face with these people, pouring out his heart to them, the letter of a missionary to a church where he has labored with much pain and affliction, and yet with great success; full of love, full of consolation, full of exhortation, it blazes, every line of it, with his

own fiery impulse and passionate devotion to Christ, and love for them.

ANALYSIS OF DR. BROADUS

Introduction, 1 : 1.

1. Reminding them of the past—1 : 2, 3.
   (a) When he was with them—1 : 2.
   (b) Since his departure—3.
2. Exhortations for the future—4 : 1—5 : 25.
   Farewell Salutation—5 : 26-28.

QUESTIONS

1. What the comparative value of Paul's letters?
2. What eighteen books must one read to understand fully the spirit of Paul?
3. How many and what groups of Paul's letters, what the books of each group, and when and where was each book written?
4. Of what does each group treat?
5. What are the periods of Paul's life?
6. What the different views of Paul in the Acts and his letters?
7. What the variety of style in his letters?
8. What the geographical situation of Thessalonica, and what the land and sea advantages?
9. What the history of Thessalonica before Paul went there?
10. What its history since Paul's day, and what its present condition?
11. What distinguished Roman citizen wrote letters from Thessalonica, and how do they compare with Paul's letters to the church there?
12. What the place of the church at Thessalonica in history, what its missionary activity, and with what church do the people there now affiliate?
13. Give briefly how Christianity reached Thessalonica, Paul's method there, and the results?
14. What did Paul preach while he was there?
15. What of the moral condition of these people, and how did Paul deal with it?
16. What the occasion of this letter?
17. Who wrote it?
18. Where did he write it?
19. When did he write it?
20. What is the character, or style, of this letter as a piece of composition?
21. Give the short analysis by Broadus.

VII

EXPOSITION—PART I

Scripture: I Thess. 1: 1—3: 13

WE SHALL follow a full and extended analysis that takes cognizance of everything in this letter. In that analysis the first thing that we consider is the salutation: "Paul, and Silvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ: Grace to you and peace."

It was customary in ancient times for a salutation to introduce two matters. The Romans particularly had that habit. In this salutation the first question is, Who saluted? The answer is, Paul, Silvanus and Timothy, who co-labored in the establishment of this church. The next question is, Whom saluted? "The church of the Thessalonians in God the Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." Note (speaking of the Greek word *ekklesia,* which is rendered "church") that there were three ecclesias in Thessalonica at one time: First, the Jewish synagogue; second, the Greek ecclesia—that civil body which managed the affairs of the city. To these two that are already there a new ecclesia comes, a new congregation having a new business, giving a new atmosphere, and that is the church or ecclesia of God the Father. But when it adds "and the Lord Jesus Christ," that separates it from the Jewish church. That also

separated it from that civil business body, the Greek ecclesia.

Is this the first letter ever written to a Christian church of which we have any knowledge? Before answering, read Acts 15. James' letter precedes it in order of time, but it was not addressed to a church.

The next item in the letter is the salutation proper, "Grace and peace." If one will pass rapidly over the letters of Paul, he will find that he followed the Oriental custom of salutations. Nearly all the time he brought in "grace and peace" and sometimes added "mercy." It is interesting to take the beginning of all his letters and see how in writing them he salutes them in that way. It was the grace of God that secured their salvation, and through their justification they found peace with God.

The next division is the thanksgiving. That commences at verse 2 and includes verse 10—a most marvelous thanksgiving: "We give thanks to God always for you all, making mention of you in our prayers; remembering without ceasing your work of faith and labor of love and patience of hope in our Lord Jesus Christ, before our God and Father." Here it would be interesting to take up the letters of Paul and notice his custom, right after the salutation, of putting in a thanksgiving if he had anything to be thankful for. Trace that through his letters and see if he does not, as here, in wishing grace and peace to the people to whom he writes, first seek out the ground of thankfulness that he has toward God concerning them. There was one church to whom he wrote in which he omitted the thanksgiving —the church of the Galatians. They had taken the back track to such a fearful degree that Paul, when he wrote to them, left out the thanksgiving.

Notice in the second place the extent and broadness of his thanksgiving here. It exceeds any that we find anywhere else: "We give thanks unto God always for you all," all the way and all the time. When he wrote a letter to the Corinthians and put in his thanksgiving he could not give thanks for everyone of them, for one of them had been guilty of an awful sin, and of others of them he said that, even weeping, he must say that they were enemies of Christ.

Paul says to these Thessalonians, "Every time I pray for you I thank God for you, and second, every time I remember three things about you, your work of faith, your labor of love, your patience of hope, I also thank God for you." Notice Paul's trinity of Christian graces —faith, hope and love. He brings that out in his Letter to the Colossians and again in I Cor. 13: "But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." Here compare the three heathen graces, which may be found in Anthon's "Classical Dictionary," with the three Christian graces, and tell wherein the Christian graces are superior to the heathen graces.

Notice the work of faith, Greek *ergon,* the labor of love, *kopos,* and the endurance of hope, *hupomone.* I am inclined to think that these Thessalonians through their faith had done some miraculous work that we do not know anything about. When we read Hebrews 11 we see the great work that faith did, and each one has a particular work: "By faith Enoch was translated, by faith Abram, by faith Noah, by faith Rahab, etc." Each one performed some mighty exploit, an *ergon,* or work— "the work of faith." This being singular, *ergon,* I am inclined to think that there was some explicit exploit rendered by these Thessalonians to which Paul refers when he says, "Every time I remember your work of

faith I am thankful." Just what the particular work was I do not know. It was a work of faith in the Roman amphitheatre when the brave Christian woman preferred to be cast to the wild beasts rather than abjure her faith. These Thessalonians were very much persecuted after they had professed the Christian religion, and there may have been some signal incident of persecution. Anyhow, faith that does not work is not worth a cent. These are the three things that every time Paul thought of the Thessalonians he was thankful about.

Now we come to a new topic, beginning with verse 4: "Knowing, brethren beloved of God, your election, how that our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Spirit, and in much assurance; even as you know what manner of men we showed ourselves toward you for your sake. And ye became imitators of us, and of the Lord, having received the word in much affliction, with joy of the Holy Spirit; so that ye became an ensample to all that believe in Macedonia and in Achaia. For from you hath sounded forth the Word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth; so that we need not to speak anything. For they themselves report concerning us what manner of entering in we had unto you; and how ye turned unto God from idols, to serve a living and true God, and to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come."

"I am thankful," says Paul (mentioning three reasons why he is thankful), "every time I pray; every time I remember the three things; every time I know that you are elected, I am thankful."

Let us consider somewhat the matter of election. It

is something that may be known. He says he knew it.

Once I helped to ordain a man for whom I conducted the examination. I asked the questions just as fast as I could fire the shots at him:

"What does election mean?"

"To choose."

"Who chooses?"

"God."

"When?"

"Before the foundation of the world."

"Unto what?"

"Salvation."

"In whom?"

"In Christ."

"Was this election based on foreseen repentance and faith, or did repentance and faith result from the election?"

This was the thing that Paul was discussing: "I am thankful, brethren, because I know you are elected. You are chosen of God unto salvation through sanctification of the Spirit, and belief of the truth in Jesus Christ."

That being the doctrine of election, that God chose those people in eternity, yet Paul here in time could find out. So what are the tokens or signs that one is elected? These tokens are of two kinds: Signs to Paul, the preacher, and signs in them, or the evidence that they are the elect. When he saw these signs he knew they were elect. How important that thing is for us. Our articles of faith say it is our privilege and duty to ascertain whether we are elected. We ought to find out whether we have been chosen of God. There is a way to find out: "How that our gospel came not unto you in word only, but also in power, and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance."

I heard a man once quote that to show that these Thessalonians had assurance because they had faith. He is not talking about *their* assurance but *his* assurance—that he (Paul) preached not in word only, but in power and in the Holy Spirit and in much assurance. From this he argued: "I come to a place to preach. Do I find that I can preach there? Do I feel drawn to preach there? Am I impressed in my heart that the Lord has a people to call out? Does it impress me so that when I go to preach I feel that the power of the Holy Spirit is with me? If I can feel these things, that is a token that somebody there belongs to the elect."

But that does not locate the elect. It shows that they are there, but not which ones. But these are the signs in them: "Ye received this Word which I preached, not as from men, but as God's Word, or the manner in which you listened to me; second, your conversion: 'Ye turned unto God from idols to serve the living and true God.'"

Notice next: "And to wait for His Son from heaven, whom He raised from the dead, even Jesus, who delivereth us from the wrath to come." In other words, "When I see how you heard me, from what your turned, to what you turned, that patient waiting for the risen Lord, that you had faith in Him, the patience of hope—hope which takes cognizance of the second coming of Christ, your waiting under great afflictions, I know that you are elect."

Another token is, "You became imitators of the church of Judea in suffering affliction and persecution. If when you were persecuted you had fallen away and said, 'If being a Christian is to walk this hot road I will turn back and seek the shade,'" then, he would have known that they were not the elect, but since they heard his

preaching as the Word of God, turned from idols and patiently waited for the coming of the Lord, who was to deliver from the wrath to come, and since while waiting they followed the footsteps of Christians elsewhere, imitating these Christians in bearing up patiently under the persecutions to which they were subjected, he had that assurance. For instance, Jason whom they arrested and took before the magistrate and put under bond to keep the peace, they would have put to death if they had had the power. "Jason, does this prejudice you against the religion you profess?"

John Bunyan tells how Christian and Pliable came to the Slough of Despond, and they both fell in the mire, and Pliable began to say, "Is this the great road you are talking about to the great country you are going to? I am going back to the country I came from." As we look at him we know that he was not elect. But if this other man, though sinking in the Slough of Despond, finally pulls out, covered with dirt, yet with his face toward the heavenly city, that is a token that he is elect.

Still another token: "So that ye became an ensample to all that believe in Macedonia and in Achaia." That is, they became an example in all Greece and Peloponnesus. "For from you hath sounded forth the Word of the Lord, not only in Macedonia and Achaia, but in every place your faith to God-ward is gone forth." When we want to consider the question of election, here we have it.

God does not permit us to climb a ladder and go into His secret archives and turn the pages and see if a man's name is written in the Lamb's Book of Life. But He does permit us to know whether we are elect or whether anybody else is elect.

When this knowledge comes to the missionary that the

men to whom he preaches are elect, then he is thankful, as Paul says, "knowing your election."

We come now to the next item in the full analysis. The 5th general head is, The Reminder of the Past. What is it he reminds them of? 2:1-2: "For yourselves, brethren, know our entering in unto you, that it hath not been found vain; but having suffered before and been shamefully treated, as ye know, at Philippi, we waxed bold in our God to speak unto you the gospel of God in much conflict." In other words, "Now, you know when I got there from Philippi, so bruised from those stripes received from the lictor's rod, and weak from imprisonment, brethren, ye remember how boldly I came to you and preached the gospel of Jesus Christ. I was not scared. I was not discouraged on account of receiving punishment at the hands of the lictors in Philippi. I had no idea of turning back."

Here are some negative things to which he wants to call our attention, and what a pity that every preacher could not say this: "For our exhortation is not of error [he brought them no heresy], nor of uncleanness, nor in guile; . . . not as pleasing men, . . . for neither at any time were we found using words of flattery, as ye know, nor a cloak of coveteousness, God is witness; nor seeking glory of men." Let us get these "nots." He is reminding them of things when he was with them before, calling their attention to his manner of entering in and preaching to them; that wherever he went and preached, he didn't preach a heresy; that he didn't go in uncleanness as the teachers of the heathen did, using their influence over their disciples to bring them to shame; not in guile; not to make money; not, indeed to please. "I am not seeking your pleasure, nor flattering you." How hard it is to keep a preacher, when

he sits down by some member of his church, from saying a few flattering words. Paul calls their attention to the fact that when he preached among them he did not use flattery.

Let us see what he did: "But we were gentle in the midst of you, as when a nurse cherisheth her own children; how gentle she is!" Paul says, "I was not rough, affectionately desirous of you." "I was with you in affection." "Willing not only to impart the gospel to you, but my own soul. For ye remember, brethren, our labor and travail, that we might not be a burden to you, working every day and night." They were heathen; it was missionary ground, and they knew nothing about the principles of missionary support. If he had demanded a salary of these heathen, he never would have gotten them. That is why we have to pay a missionary a salary. They are going where there are no churches and where the very mention of compensation turns the people away that we want to convert.

Notice again: "Ye are witnesses, and God also, how holily and righteously and unblamably we behaved ourselves toward you that believe; as ye know how we dealt with each one of you, as a father with his own children."

When I get to reading Paul, it digs me up by the roots, so that I feel like I have never done the right kind of preaching and did not have the right kind of spirit.

The next thing is his impeachment of the Jews, 2:14: "For ye also suffered the same things of your own countrymen, even as they did of the Jews; who both killed the Lord Jesus and the prophets, and drove out us, and please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they may be saved; to fill up their sins always; but the wrath is come upon

them to the uttermost." That is a fearful indictment against his people, and every word of it is true.

From 2:17 on to the end of chapter 3, he reminds them of the things since he left them. He goes on to show that since he left them he had continually desired to come back, and twice tried to come back, but Satan hindered him, and in order that something might be added to their faith, he was willing to be left alone at Athens in order that Timothy might go back and supply what was lacking in their faith. So on through chapter 3.

QUESTIONS

1. What the salutation of this letter, verbatim, who saluted, and whom saluted?
2. What the three *ecclesias* at Thessalonica, and what the distinguishing characteristics of each?
3. Was this the first N. T. letter written to a church?
4. What two things does Paul, according to oriental custom, introduce in this salutation, and why?
5. What was Paul's habit as to what followed the salutation of his letters, and what notable exception?
6. Show the extent and broadness of this thanksgiving, and how Paul was limited in some other thanksgivings in his letters.
7. What Paul's trinity of Christian graces, and wherein are they superior to the heathen graces?
8. What did Paul remember in the Thessalonians which furnished a ground of thanksgiving, and what the meaning and application of these things?
9. What is election, who elects, when, unto what, in whom, and what the relation of election to repentance and faith?
10. Show how Paul knew of their election of God, (1) from signs in him, and (2) from signs in them.
11. What the literal meaning of conversion, and what illustration of it in this letter?
12. What the characteristics of Paul's preaching while at Thessalonica, and what the characteristics of their reception of his preaching?
13. What claim does Paul make for his life among them?
14. Describe the terrible indictment Paul brings against his own people in 2:14-16.
15. Give an anaylsis of 2:17—3:13, pointing out its principal teachings.

VIII

A LESSON ON CHRISTIAN MORALS

Scripture: I Thess. 4: 1-18

THIS exposition commences at I Thess. 4, which brings us to the sixth item of the extended analysis, the title of which is, "A Lesson on Christian Morals," that is, it consists of an exhortation to purity of life, to brotherly love and to honest work.

Let us observe here, as in all of Paul's letters, how the practical is deduced from the doctrinal. He had no conception of the practical apart from the doctrinal, otherwise this letter might have closed with the end of chapter 3, making good doctrinal sense, but it was ever Paul's custom, after he had written the body of the discourse and of the theory, to transmute this further into the fruits of godliness.

Let us look at the first lesson on Christian morals: "Finally then, brethren, we beseech and exhort you in the Lord Jesus, that, as ye received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, even as ye do walk,—that ye abound more and more. For ye know what charge we gave you through the Lord Jesus. For this is the will of God, even your sanctification, that ye abstain from fornication; that each one of you know how to possess himself of his own vessel in sanctification and honor, not in the passion of lust, even as the Gentiles who know not God; that no man transgress, and wrong

his brother in the matter; because the Lord is an avenger in all these things, as also we forewarned you and testified. For God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification. Therefore, he that rejecteth, rejecteth not man, but God, who giveth His Holy Spirit unto you."

That is a remarkable lesson, and particularly let us observe the necessity, in the case of these Gentile converts, for this exhortation, owing to the past habits of their lives. I mean that their religious habits were associated with the most debasing crimes and uncleanness, and it was a difficulty in the way of gospel preachers then, as our missionaries in heathen lands find it today, after men are converted to keep them from relapsing into those vile, beastly sins of the body.

I witnessed our missionaries dealing with that problem in Mexico, where the peons, or low class of Mexicans, know not what decency of life means. They were converted or professed to be, but what a difficult thing it was for the missionary to impress upon their consciences the sanctity of the family, or the chastity of the marriage relation.

Note this reference: "God called us not for uncleanness, but in sanctification." It is as noticeable in the conversion of a sinner as it is in the call to the ministry. The call, made through the gospel and by the power of the Holy Spirit, singles out a man and brings him in touch with God, and wherever it is a true and effectual calling it always ends in justification, sanctification and the glorification of the body. Paul says, "Whom He called them He also justified, and whom He justified them He also glorified." The glorification of the body is its complete sanctification and freedom from all dishonor, weakness and immorality. Whoever then sins, sins against the call that he received that made him a

Christian. On that account, notice the nature of the offense: "Therefore, he that rejecteth [that command], rejecteth not man, but God [because it was God who called him], who giveth his Holy Spirit unto you." If he be a Christian, the Holy Spirit is dwelling in him. In many places in Paul's letters the exhortation to purity of life is based on the doctrine that our bodies are the temples of the Holy Spirit, and that whosoever defileth or destroyeth the temple of God, him will God destroy.

The second exhortation is brotherly love: "But concerning the love of the brethren ye have no need that one write unto you: for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another; for indeed ye do it toward all the brethren that are in all Macedonia. But we exhort you, brethren, that ye abound [in this love] more and more." There is a beautiful thought there, that the love which a Christian has for a fellow-Christian is the result of going to school to God—that God himself teaches the lesson. Hence our old-time Baptist preachers, in preaching upon the evidence of conversion, dealt particularly on love: "We know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren."

I remember once in a great meeting a little girl timidly came forward and offered to join the church. She was very small, and one of the brethren moved that the case be deferred—that she seemed too young to understand. I said, "Let us be sure we are right before we defer this case. This child is old enough to trust and old enough to love, and we will hear what she says for herself." So I put this question: "Little daughter, how do you know that you love God's people?" She said, "I have thought about that, and I have asked myself this question, 'If I should come to a place where the road of life forks, one way very pleasant and the other very

unpleasant, and God's people went the unpleasant way, which crowd would I prefer to follow?' and I thought that I should prefer to go with God's people over a bad road than with ungodly people over a good road, because I love God's people more than the other people." Whereupon, the objectors began to distrust their wisdom, and when I examined her on faith she seemed to possess the sweetest trust in Jesus that I ever heard related. Where did she get it? She was God-taught. Young as she was, she had been a pupil of the Almighty, and she had learned to love and trust Jehovah, and she had just as clear ideas about what is meant by loving the people of God by which we may know that we have passed from death unto life, as any grown person. There was not an objection in the house when we took the vote on receiving her for baptism. Young people are more apt to prove faithful than those who are converted when they are advanced in life.

He continues his exhortation: "And that ye study to be quiet, and to do your own business, and to work with your hands, even as we charged you; that ye may walk becomingly toward them that are without, and may have need of nothing." What a sturdy Christianity Paul had! A loafer and a dead-beat got no respect from him at all. If able, anybody ought to work, not only that he may not lack anything, but in order that he may walk honestly before them that are without. Idleness leads to theft and dishonesty, and Paul elevates labor very high in dignity.

I read two things in the papers recently that pleased me very much. One was that the Ladies' Aid Society of the Baptist Church at Mart, wanting to make a contribution, got in a wagon and went two miles in the country to a farm and picked a lot of cotton for which they

received $12. That was no degradation to those women. The other thing was, that Deacon M. H. Standifer, of the First Church at Waco, took a wagon load of Baylor University boys out one Saturday and picked cotton, although it rained. Surely the Christian religion is in favor of good honest work. There is not a bit of shame in it.

Paul told these Thessalonians squarely that if anybody would not work, he must not eat—that he was not entitled even to his one meal a day, much less three meals, if he was an idler. If a man had a hundred million dollars, he would be both sinful and unhappy if he did not work. One of the kings of France had a carpenter's shop fixed up for him, and he went out there and worked at that business. His wife had a dairy, and there she would take her maids of honor and teach them how to keep their milk vessels clean, and have sweeter cream and make better butter than anyone else in the whole kingdom.

We come now to the richest and sweetest things in all the Word of God, which brings us to the seventh item of the analysis. This extends from 4:13 to 5:11, and bears upon the great doctrine of the second advent, using certain facts to enable him to comfort all the people who were needlessly distressed concerning their dead.

I want to make perfectly clear the significance of this great passage of scripture. I will venture the assertion that almost every preacher who has conducted many funeral services has used this scripture. Let us see how rich it is in thought and meaning, and see if we can't get some new light: "But we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning them that fall asleep; that ye sorrow not, even as the rest who have no hope." Ig-

norance concerning the state of the dead necessarily brings great anxiety and sorrow. We may be ignorant about human history, of the sciences, about the commonest facts of the world, but it is awful for us to be ignorant concerning the state of the dead. Upon that subject God has flashed the light of the brightest knowledge, and because of that bright light the keenness of sorrow is taken out of our hearts when our Christian loved ones die.

The special point of their ignorance that caused them sorrow was their belief that to die before Christ came would be a calamity. If one could just live until Christ came it would be all right, but he would suffer loss to die before Christ came. Paul wants to show them that it does not make the snap of a finger's difference about whether we die before Christ comes or not, and it is foolish to set our hearts upon being alive when Christ comes. That desire arises from ignorance of the state of the righteous dead. If we notice the state of the righteous dead, we would see no difference in dying before Christ comes or being alive when He comes.

The next thought is that when a good man dies his spirit goes to Jesus. In that respect he is ahead of us who are alive. Hence, Paul says, "Brethren, for me to die is gain, for when I am absent from the body I am present with the Lord." No loss there. As Jesus said, "Father, into thy hands I commend my Spirit." As the Book of Ecclesiastes says, "Then shall the body return to the dust as it was, but the spirit unto God who gave it." Get that fixed, that when the earthly house of this tabernacle is dissolved we have a building with God, a house not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. The advantage, then, is with the one that dies. Paul says, "On my part it will be a gain to die; personally, I would be

much better off, for when I am dead I shall be with the Lord."

Here are some doctrines: If the soul of a Christian lodges in some half-way house, and is under some disability while there, and has to stay there until the resurrection day, well may we weep over our dead; well may we desire to be alive till Jesus comes. If the soul is imprisoned somewhere and does not go directly to heaven, I can understand those Thessalonians weeping over their dead. If the Roman Catholic theory that when a soul dies it goes into some intermediate place and is in suffering and flames, be true, well may we weep and make gifts to the priests to pray our people out of that awful place. But if the soul, just as soon as the body dies, goes right to heaven, and right to the presence of God himself, we ought not to be ignorant of that. What a corrective of unnecessary sorrow!

Therefore, I have always combated the theory of any middle-place where the soul lodges and stays till the Judgment day. I am sure it is not a teaching of the New Testament. I am sure if it had been the teaching of the New Testament the Thessalonians would have had something to sorrow about, and Paul could not have comforted them. They are gone to God, the Judge. They are where God is, where the angels are, the new Jerusalem, the heavenly Zion, to the spirits of the just made perfect, to Jesus, the Mediator.

Jesus said to the thief on the cross, "Today shalt thou be with me in Paradise." The poor, ignorant thief prayed, "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom." Not "then," but "today, shalt thou be with me in Paradise," says Jesus.

In the Book of Revelation, we see that the tree of life is on the river of life that rises under the throne of

God. Let us get that point deep in our hearts, and let us not preach any half-way house for the dead. "It came to pass that the rich man also died and in hell he lifted up his eyes." He did not lodge anywhere.

That idea of a middle-life was derived in Medieval Christianity, in the dark ages, coming from heathen origin. The heathen (and these were the heathen that had just been converted, these very Greeks), believed that if one died and was unburied, for example if drowned and the body not recovered, then the soul or shade would wander around unblessed until the body was buried. In the book of Virgil, a shade meets the poet as he was descending into the lower world, a flitting, restless spirit, and says, "Oh bury me, bury me! And if you cannot put me under the ground, then it may serve to sprinkle a little sand on me, and count it for a burial." It was precisely that thought that led to the institution of sprinkling instead of immersion. Those poor Thessalonian people had all the terrors about those who died.

Notice, in the next place, that when Jesus comes He will bring with Him those spirits of the Christians whose bodies died here upon the earth. They are up there, and when He starts back here, the spirits will be with Him. It is only the body that sleeps. So the truth of the hymn, "Asleep in Jesus, blessed sleep!" Charles Wesley, in his dying hymn, presented the change, or transfiguring, of the bodies of the living, so there is no advantage in living on the earth until the second coming of Christ, and the souls of the living people do not get to Christ first, because Christ brings those Christian souls who are dead with Him.

There is an equal participation between those who live until He does come and those who died before He comes. The dead are raised, and the living are changed, so to-

gether they are caught up. Where is any advantage? We may ask where Paul gets all this. He says, "I received this gospel, and with it I received knowledge of the Word of God, and I am taking away all this trouble concerning the dead. The Lord himself shall descend."

It will be a real coming. The coming of the Lord is a personal thing. He comes in death, He comes in the judgment, but I have always contended that the personal coming of the Lord is the hope of the world.

"For the Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and with the trump of God."

In studying the gospels we find what the shout is: "Behold the bridegroom cometh! Go ye out to meet him!" And we have found out who sounds the trumpet.

It was not Gabriel. That is Negro theology. The object of the blowing of that trumpet is not to wake the dead, but to summon the holy angels. All the angels will come down when He comes, and there will be that great trumpet-sound that waxes louder and louder and louder until their hearts within them shall be stirred. Job says, "Hide me in the grave until thy wrath has passed; thou wilt call and I will answer thee."

Just as Jesus stood before the tomb of Lazarus and said, "Lazarus, come forth!" so He will speak and call our names, and our bodies will arise, and when He comes that second time there will be a mighty shout, "Behold the bridegroom!" All of the earth and heaven will ring with sonorous peals of that shout, the sealed doors of death will be opened, and the Spirit's power will then throw off the cerements of the grave in response to the voice of Jesus Christ.

Notice the double voice: To the living, "Behold the bridegroom!" To the dead: "Come forth!" You see

how the voice is adapted to each case. It also says the voice of the archangel.

There is a passage in the Book of Revelation that has sometimes been interpreted to mean what the archangel says. That says, "I saw another mighty angel come down from heaven . . . and he set his right foot upon the sea, and his left foot on the earth . . . and lifted up his hand to heaven and swear . . . that there should be time no longer," *i. e.*, the end of time.

That is beautiful, but I question the interpretation. I think that it means when that angel plants one foot upon the sea and the other foot upon the shore, it is an answer to the prayers of those Christians, "How long, O Lord, how long?" Then the angel says, "Time was, time is, but there shall be time no longer. You will get our answer now." I think that is the meaning. There are hierarchies in the angelic body, principalities and powers. Michael is called the prince, Gabriel is a prince, and in connection with him we have all the traditions about the trumpet.

It is that trumpet sound that brings the angels. They have double work to do. In the parable of the tares it is said that the tares and the wheat grow together until the harvest. The harvest is the end of the world. The good seed are the Christians; the bad seed are the devil's children. They grow together until the harvest. At the end of the world the angels shall gather up the tares ready for burning, and that is one reason why another parable tells us that at the coming of the Lord the angels shall gather up the wicked out of every place on the earth, and that is the office of the angels. That is why in that great prophecy he tells about two women, one of whom is taken and the other left. The angel swoops down and that woman is taken—one gathered

to the harvest for heaven, and the other gathered for the pit of hell.

Imagine the joy! It comforts me a great deal. As it is, my body is not a very satisfactory body. The head gets sick; the heart sore; the hand gets a finger nail mashed off; the muscles take the rheumatism; it looks like everything in it is a disappointment. But at that time the body is at rest. It is sown in the image of the first Adam, and raised in the image of the second Adam. When that time comes and the disembodied spirit, now being able to get back into the old house which has been regenerated, will rejoice, and it will be a time of great joy.

I noticed a bird last year, which seemed to come from afar. I knew the bird, for it had a broken wing. We had allowed it to build its nest in a certain place. When she saw the nest still there she commenced to rejoice and sing her glad song of home-coming. In like manner the soul, like a bird which flies into its old nest, leaps into the body glorified, and then, as Paul says, it is sanctified, body, soul and spirit. What a happy time when the long separated parts are brought together!

QUESTIONS

1. What three moral virtues are inculcated in I Thess. 4: 1-12?
2. What Paul's conception of the relation between doctrine and morals? Illustrate from this letter.
3. What the special application of 4: 1-8 to the Thessalonians, and what illustration from modern missionary work?
4. What the relation of the Gospel to a sinner and the life? What the nature of the offense when a Christian sins, and why?
5. What the great lesson on Love in 4: 9, 10?
6. What the great lesson on honest work in 4: 11, 12?
7. What illustration of this in modern history?
8. What great consolation is given in 4: 13-18?
9. What the relation of the ignorance of the future state to human sorrow?
10. What the special point of their ignorance which caused their sorrow, and how does Paul relieve their fears?

11. With whom is the advantage, those who live till Christ's second advent, or those who die before, and why?
12. What great heresy suggested by this passage, and what the proof to the contrary?
13. What the origin of this heresy, and what examples cited?
14. When the poet wrote, "Asleep in Jesus! blessed sleep!" what was his meaning?
15. How does Paul show that there is an equal participation between those who live till Christ comes and those who die before He comes?
16. What the shout of 4:16?
17. Who will sound the trumpet, and what its purpose?
18. What the double voice? Illustrate.
19. What questionable interpretation here cited, and what the true interpretation?
20. Are there hierarchies among the angels, and what the proof?
21. What the double work of the angels at Christ's second advent?
22. Illustrate the joy of the soul returning to its glorified body.

IX

A BODY OF RULES

Scripture: I Thess. 5: 1-28

THIS fifth chapter is mainly a body of rules. The first part of it needs explanation. The chapter commences thus:

"But concerning the times and the seasons, brethren, ye have no need that aught be written unto you. For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." He has just been comforting the Thessalonians with the account of the second coming of our Lord, with the resurrection of the bodies of the righteous before the change in the living righteous, saying that the two classes are caught up together in the air to join the Lord and are ever to be with the Lord. So far he has not discussed the effect of the coming of our Lord upon the wicked. We will have the case of the wicked in the second letter.

He says here, "But concerning the times and the seasons," and there is a distinction in the meaning of "times" and "seasons." "Times" means stretches of time, or periods. They had doubtless written a question to him to this effect: "Tell us precisely how long it will be before Jesus comes, on what day He will come, and what hour." He is here replying to that question, saying that it is not necessary for him to write on that, because he has already explained to them that neither

the times nor the seasons has God put in any man's power. That is what our Savior taught. No angel in heaven and no apostle knew, and the Son of Man, in the limitations of His humanity, did not know.

But while our Lord as to His human nature did not know, while no angel knew, and while no apostle knew, we are not at all surprised to find a great many who do know exactly this very thing of all others that God has hidden from any human or angelic sight. I call attention now, particularly, to this subject, as it is fascinating, and as some people are attracted so much by the curious and sensational things of religion. They prefer to preach sermons on these subjects rather than upon faith, hope and love. They seek an answer to questions that God has not answered to any angel of heaven, or apostle on the earth, and that was hidden even from the humanity of Jesus Christ.

There seems to be a little irony in Paul's reply. They want to know precisely. He says, "For yourselves know perfectly that the day of the Lord so cometh as a thief in the night." Our Lord himself discussed that very question. He taught that if the householder knew exactly what month a burglar would come around, and on what night of the month, and at what hour of the night, it would be a very easy thing to forestall him. But God hid those things, and now just as a burglar does not write to a man that on November 9 at 11 p. m. he will call at his house and come in through the back window in order to steal his jewelry and whatever money is lying around, so we need not expect such information with reference to the second coming of Christ.

Christ's second coming will be like a flash of lightning from one end of the heavens to the other. There will be no external premonition of it.

He then assures them that this fact need not disturb them, however terrible it may be to the wicked. He says, "God has not appointed you unto wrath but to obtain salvation by our Lord Jesus Christ who died for you that whether you wake or sleep you shall live together with Him. Inasmuch as you are guaranteed against the thief by the protecting care of God, it makes no difference what night the thief comes. Whether you live till Christ comes, whether He comes heralded or unheralded, it is utterly immaterial with you, because from the beginning He has chosen you for salvation and you will get the benefit of that salvation when He comes."

Now come some rules, a few of which need comment. The others are all so obvious in their meaning that an attempt at explanation will only mystify. The first one is in the 12th and 13th verses: "But we beseech you, brethren, to know them that labor among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you; and to esteem them exceeding highly in love for their work's sake." That shows that even this early there were those set apart by the Lord as preachers, and having the oversight of churches, and He is writing that they should approve their preachers and should be subordinated to the rule of the pastor in the things in which it is lawful for him to rule, and there are things in which God has made him the overseer. That is what the word, "bishop," or *episkopos,* means.

I have heard some people say that the work of the church should be determined by the deacons. That is expressly not so.

The deacons have committed unto them the finances of the church, but the great work of the church is dependent upon the spiritual leader. It is his voice that must give the signal, it is his sermon that must give the

instruction, it is his exposition of God's Word that must lay down the law, and in this high sense he is the legitimate ruler.

There is a spirit of lawlessness in the world that objects to all rule. There are some people so constituted that they won't work "in the harness" at all. There are some horses that won't work except in the lead, and some that are not good except as wheel-horses, and others that will not work at all with a bridle or harness; they kick and squeal and prance, and finally tear off at a tangent. There are some people of that kind in the churches.

Here are some rules that need no comment: "Be at peace among yourselves,—admonish the disorderly, encourage the faint-hearted, support the weak, be long-suffering toward all. See that none render unto anyone evil for evil; but always follow after that which is good, one toward another, and toward all. Rejoice always; pray without ceasing; in everything give thanks: for this is the will of God in Christ Jesus to you-ward." These are rules which everybody ought to memorize, and be able to call up each one. They ought to be on the walls of every church as the standing orders of the Lord Jesus Christ concerning Christian communities.

Here are others that need some explanation: "Quench not the Spirit; despise not prophesyings; prove all things; hold fast that which is good." Every one of these directions relates to the spiritual gifts conferred on the day of Pentecost and later in the apostolic days. I have heard preachers preach from the text, "Quench not the Spirit," and speak on it as if it referred to the witness of the Spirit within a man, or to the indwelling Spirit in a man or to the Spirit of regeneration. But none of these can be quenched. What he says, "Quench you not," is this special miraculous endowment that God be-

stowed so richly upon the apostolic churches for the purpose of attesting them. He gives rules both ways on these spiritual gifts: "Don't quench them. They were given for a useful purpose." He taught in the letter to the Corinthians that a man had control over them, and he could so act that they would depart from him altogether. "Despise not prophesyings," *i. e.,* don't hold in contempt these utterances that come from the lips of men that have these gifts. A man would leap up in the church and say, "Brethren, the Spirit is moving me, and under the Spirit I want to make a declaration," and he would make it. In other words, "No matter what you may think about what he will say, don't quench the spiritual gifts, and don't despise prophesyings, but test what he is saying." In another letter John says, "Try the spirits to see whether they be from God." There are some spirits that are not from God. There is an inspiration that comes not from God. There is devil-inspiration.

We had in Waco when I was a young pastor a great stir upon the subject of spirit-rapping, mediums and alleged communications from the dead. I preached on the subject about a week and put these things to the test, just as God commands that they should be tested. The question I put to one of these mediums was this: "Did Jesus Christ as God become manifest in the flesh?" The answer was, "No, that is a misapprehension." That answer settled his case, and I said, "You are condemned, because the scripture says that whosoever denieth that Christ is come in the flesh is a liar and the truth is not in him." That is what Paul means here. He is not referring to their conversion, nor to the Spirit that bore witness with their spirits that they were children of God, nor to regeneration, but this temporary miraculous gift

that rested with such signal power upon the apostolic church.

He says, "Prove all," not all things, but all these prophesyings, that claim to come from the Spirit. "Hold fast to that which is good." In other words, "If it corresponds to the revealed will of God set forth in the Bible, you may take it. If it is contrary to that, reject it."

The next rule calls also for some explanation. In the King James version, it reads: "Abstain from all appearance of evil." In my younger days how many times have I heard the old brethren quote that! It was not enough for them that a thing was bad; if it appeared to be evil, one had to shun it. That is not the meaning of it at all. The rendering is bound to be one of these two: "Abstain from every form of evil," not something that simply appears to be evil; or else it means, "Abstain from every evil show." There are some shows we ought not to attend. I went once in my life to a theatrical representation, and I was glad I had no young lady with me. When I got out I apologized to myself and told the Lord if He would forgive me I would never go to see an evil show of that kind any more. There are some shows so suggestive of indecency, in word, or posture, or dress, they advertise their vileness. What he teaches is, "Let evil come in any shape it may—abstain from it."

Another passage, just here, needs a little explanation. It is his prayer, "The God of peace himself sanctify you wholly." That means "entire." If we say concerning a thing composed of fourteen parts, "Let it be sanctified wholly," that would mean in every one of its parts. And he continues, "And may your spirit and soul and body be preserved entire, without blame, at the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ." Here a question has been

asked as to whether there be a threefold distinction in the nature of man. Are there three distinct parts in man—body, soul and spirit, or a tripartite nature? Or is man of a dual nature—soul and body? In systematic theology, those that hold to the dual nature of man are called dichotomists, and those who hold to the threefold nature of man are called trichotomists. My view of the subject is that from the beginning God represents man as consisting of two distinct elements, the inward man, and the outward man. The outward man is the body; the inward man is the soul. When we consider the inward man from another viewpoint we call it spirit.

Here it is important to note the time when sanctification is consummated—"At the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ," that is, when the body is raised from the dead and glorified. Then only is a man completely sanctified. His soul, or spirit, is sanctified at death, but his body is not sanctified until the resurrection, and that is when Christ comes.

The last thing I need to say about anything in this chapter is this: "I adjure you by the Lord that this epistle be read unto all the brethren." He wrote this letter to the church. Every member of the church is entitled to hear it. What a lesson that is to us that the Word of God is for everybody! It is not for the preacher to take the letter and deal out as much of it as he pleases to the congregation; not for him to say, "I have here a letter from your heavenly Father, and I will read you such parts of it as I think will do you good." Let the man himself have his Father's letter—all of it. It was written to him. It was not written to the priest. There is no justification in withholding any part of it from a child of God.

I heard Dr. McDonald, one of the mightiest preachers

and one of the sweetest spirits of the Southern Baptist Convention, who recently passed away, give an account of his conversion from Roman Catholicism. He had been reared in that faith in Ireland, and on his visit to the United States he saw for the first time in his life a gathering in an old log house, and he went in to find a Baptist meeting in progress. He was wonderfully impressed with the way they did things, and he was surprised to hear the preacher ask the people to take their Bibles and see that everything he said was so. He did not know that he had a right of that kind, and when the old preacher very solemnly said, "Brethren, this book is God's letter to each one of you. If my mother were to write me a letter, what man would have a right to capture my mail, and come to me and tell me that he would read such passages of my mother's letter to me as he thought was best for me?" There the thought first entered his mind that became the entering wedge which separated him from the Romanist faith, and which led to his conversion. Paul wanted this letter read to every one of the members of that church.

I will comment a little on one other expression: "Salute all the brethren with a holy kiss." The reader will excuse a humorous allusion: When the great controversy between the Baptist and the Campbellite brethren came up, the latter claimed that they stood by what the book said, and one day down in South Texas one of their preachers said to the congregation, as the book says, "Salute each other with a holy kiss," that they must kiss each other, and he had been troubled about it in view of the fact that some of the brothers in the church were colored. But he says, "I insist that we do just what it says." Whereupon, another brother got up and said, "Brother moderator, we had better go slow on this;

I don't believe I could kiss a colored member of this church nor *some* of the white ones." His wife spoke up and said, "That's right, John, if you kiss a negro you shall never kiss me again."

And yet this scripture has a meaning. In the directions of our Lord to the apostles when He sent them out He said, "Salute no man by the way." He did not mean that one of His preachers should be discourteous, nor refuse to say, "How do you do?" or, "Good-bye." But in that country the forms of salutation took up a vast amount of time—they had so many "bowings and scrapings" and waving of hands. But because these apostles were on urgent business He told them to salute no man by the way. As it was an oriental custom to salute even men with a kiss, this is put in here, not prescribing that we shall kiss, but when we salute, let it be a holy salutation. Let it be the salutation of a Christian, and not insincere and simply form.

QUESTIONS

1. What the distinction in meaning between "times" and "seasons" in I Thess. 5:1, and what the application?
2. What fascinating theme for many preachers suggested here, and what the Bible teaching on it?
3. What is Paul's illustration of this thought, and what our Lord's illustration of the same point?
4. What assuring fact does Paul here give them relative to this point?
5. State the rules of holy living in 5:12-18.
6. What does 5:12, 13 show relative to "bishops," or pastors?
7. What are Paul's four rules concerning miraculous spiritual gifts?
8. What the meaning of "Quench not the Spirit?"
9. What the meaning of "Despise not prophesying?" Illustrate.
10. What the meaning of "Prove all things?"
11. What the meaning of "Hold fast that which is good?"
12. In 5:22, the common version reads, "Abstain from all appearance of evil;" does the original mean, "Abstain from

everything seeming to be evil," or "from every form of actual evil," or "from every kind of an evil show?"

13. What does "sanctify you wholly" mean, when does sanctification begin, and when will it be consummated?

14. Is man dichotomous or trichotomous, and what is the distinction between "soul" and "spirit" in 5:23?

15. What great privilege may be fairly deduced from the charge "that this epistle be read unto all the brethren," what religious denomination violates this principle most, and what illustration cited by the author?

16. How may be interpreted the "holy kiss" so as to make the precept binding now?

THE BOOK OF SECOND THESSALONIANS

X

INTRODUCTION AND EXPOSITION

Scripture: II Thess. 1:1-12

WE COMMENCE this discussion with an outline of II Thessalonians and then we will give an exposition of the first chapter of the book.

Outline

1. *The occasion of this second letter to the Thessalonians.*—After writing the first letter, tidings had been received concerning the reception of the first letter and concerning the state of affairs in that church. These things particularly he had learned:

First, that the persecution was more violent than when he was there; that their love and their faith increased with the persecution.

Second, that a report was circulated as coming from one with miraculous gifts that Paul himself, either by word or letter, had taught that the day of Christ's second coming was close at hand.

Third, that in consequence of believing this report, some of these Thessalonians quit every other business. The merchant dropped his yardstick; the blacksmith threw down his hammer; the farmer left his plow in the field, and all stood around with nothing else to do ex-

cept talk about the ascension to heaven. You see why it was that Paul told them to prove those prophesyings.

II. *The time and the place.*—The place was Corinth. It was from Corinth that he wrote the first letter. The time is somewhat uncertain. Paul remained at Corinth, as we know from Acts, for eighteen months, and it may have been as much as a year between the two letters. The outline itself consists of all the points:

1. Salutation like the first letter.
2. New ground for thanksgiving.
3. Another view of our Lord's second advent.
4. Paul's prayer for them.
5. His correction of the misapprehension of the time of the advent, showing in his correction that two things must precede that advent: (1) the great apostasy, and (2) the revelation of the man of sin.
6. The plan of salvation: how that plan conduces to steadfastness, and in view of that plan, what things to hold fast.
7. Another prayer for them.
8. He asks their prayers for him.
9. Directions for corrective discipline in the church.
10. In view of reported letters from him which he did not write, he adopts for the future a method of authenticating his letters. Paul was nearly blind, and usually dictated his letters, but from now on he signs his letters with his own hand, all except one, Hebrews, and I will explain why he did not sign that when we get to it.
11. An orderly arrangement of every passage that bears upon the second coming of Christ, with the analysis of those several statements showing the sum of the teachings of them.

The first item of the analysis of this letter is the

salutation, but I have no remarks to make on the salutation contained in this second letter to the Thessalonians because everything necessary has been said on the similar one in the first letter. But in the thanksgiving that follows the salutation there is this new element: Their faith, hope and love increased in proportion to their afflictions. That is a fine testimony. Many Christian people, depressed by afflictions, say if they had an easier time they could exercise more faith and love. But these Thessalonians increased in faith and love as their tribulations increased.

We now come to the important part of the second letter. Here is a new viewpoint on the day of our Lord —the second coming of Christ. The closing paragraph of I Thess. 4 and the first paragraph of I Thess. 5, present the second coming of our Lord with reference to the Christian people, giving us some incidents, towit: That Jesus will bring with Him the spirits of all Christians who have died, and that their bodies will be raised before the living Christians are changed. In chapter 5 he adds that on the wicked, that day will come like a thief in the night, and their destruction will be wholly unanticipated. But he has very little to say about the wicked there. Here he deals with the result of the second coming just as much on the wicked as on the righteous. He does not re-open the discussion of the resurrection, which has already been clearly set forth in the first letter, but presents the doctrine of the judgment that follows the coming of our Lord. We are always to understand that there will be first a resurrection, and then a judgment. We are now to look at the judgment part of this letter.

The first thought concerns the earth. This is the language, referring to the increase of their patience and

faith in all their persecutions and afflictions: "Which is a manifest token of the righteous judgment of God," that is, here in this world when good people, pious and God-fearing, are crushed under persecutions, the mind begins to inquire, why does not God punish the wicked? Is there divine justice? Paul says the fact that these Christians bear with love and patience the wrongs put upon them is a token of the righteous judgment of God. It proves that if exact justice is not meted out in this world it will be in the world to come. When we see the good down, and evil on top, and that state continues for a great length of time, it is a token that there must be a judgment hereafter to right that wrong, or else one must doubt the justice of God.

The next thought is, that when Jesus comes He will recompense rest to the afflicted people, and afflictions to those that afflict them. Both take place when Jesus comes. There will be no difference in time, no gap between these two. It is a mistaken interpretation of the Word of God that judgment on the righteous will be separated by any great lapse of time from judgment on the wicked. The double judgment takes place at the same time. Let us see if that point is not clear: "If so be that it is a righteous thing with God to recompense affliction to them that afflict you, and to you that are afflicted rest with us, at the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus: *who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints, and to be marvelled at in all them that believed.*"

As this is *the letter* that discusses the second coming

of Christ as no other part of God's Word, giving such a comprehensive view of it, great weight should be attached to every statement in it.

No public teacher is excusable who fails to see in many perfectly plain, literal, unfigurative teachings of God's Word that the resurrection is a general resurrection, and the judgment is a general judgment, and that the two classes come before the Lord at the same time.

Particularly, note the remarkable prophecy of our Lord in Matthew 25, where He says, "When the Son of Man shall come in His glory [in His first advent He came in humiliation], and all His holy angels with Him, then shall He sit upon the throne of His glory and before Him shall be gathered all nations and He shall separate them like a man separates the goats from the sheep. And He shall say to those on the left hand, 'Depart, ye cursed, into everlasting fire,' and to those on the right hand, 'Come, ye blessed of my Father.'"

That is not allegory, parable, symbol, nor vision, but plain, literal teaching.

That is in perfect accord with His other teaching where He says that the Ninevites that were converted in the time of Jonah should rise up in the judgment with this generation. Here were converted and unconverted people rising up in the judgment together. That is exactly as He states it in the next paragraph, when He says, "The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation and shall condemn it." It is in exact accord with the literal part of Revelation, commencing at 20:11, where the white throne appears, and Him that sat thereon, and where all the dead, great and small, are brought before Him for judgment, and the books are opened. Those that are found written in the Lamb's

Book of Life are saved, and those not found written in that book are cast into the lake of fire.

I emphasize the teaching of many plain, literal passages—that when Jesus comes the whole world will stand before Him, all the angels good and bad, and judgment will be rendered to all angels and all men at the same time.

The evil angels have already received their punishment for leaving their first estate, but there is new matter for judgment in the treatment which they gave to the cause of Christ and His people. If the good angels have been ministering spirits to them that are the heirs of salvation, they will be so confirmed that it will never be possible for another angel to fall, and if the evil angels have hindered the cause of Christ they will be cast into the eternal hell prepared for them.

The judgment rendered upon good and bad is an eternal judgment. Listen at this language "Who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might."

When the saints are glorified, when their souls and bodies are re-united, there will never be any possibility for one of them to incur a future judgment, because it will be impossible for them in their new condition to sin.

Not only is the destiny eternal, but it is expressly called *punishment,* and *not consequence* in the case of the wicked. There are some people whose sensibilities shrink from the thought of anyone suffering eternal punishment. They certainly have not studied the Bible. Even here on this earth if a man become incorrigible in wickedness, we stop him by eternal laws so far as our power can go, from doing further harm. If he be not executed on the gallows, he is at least imprisoned for life. It is the love of God that inflicts that punishment and makes

it eternal. See a parent awaking in the night and beholding a wolf about to seize the baby lying on the floor asleep. Do the mother and father fold their hands and say, "Oh, it is cruel to hurt anything! Go away, Mr. Wolf, I won't hurt you?" Or does the love of that parent prompt to strike fast, hit hard, and hit to kill?

When for thousands of years the wicked have been opposing God's people, ridiculing them, inflicting wrong after wrong, and when age after age God's people have prayed, "Come, Lord Jesus," and the souls of God's saints under the altar have cried out, "How long O Lord, holy and true, wilt thou not avenge us upon our adversaries?" there must come a time when God hears that prayer and puts it forever out of the power of the wicked to oppress His people.

There is always a tendency to fixedness of type. Man after a while becomes so wicked, waxing worse and worse, that his character crystallizes. That man hates light, and he would be in hell if he were in heaven. I am not right sure but heaven would be more painful to him than hell, because he would have no sympathy with anything there. He would have only hatred and antagonism toward it. Science unites with revelation in that fixity of type. Science tells us that the tendency toward fixedness of type will bring crystallization of character that cannot change and is without remedy.

Then take this thought: What is it that keeps men here on earth from becoming totally bad? It is the restraining presence of human law, the light of religion, the illustrious examples of the saints, the preaching of the Word of God, and the Holy Spirit. Hundreds of thousands of loving fathers and mothers of Christian people are working for their salvation, but when Jesus comes, preaching stops, praying for the lost stops, and

in the place to which they go, they may indeed pray, but not be heard; their tears may fall, but not in mercy's sight. There is no gospel preached to them. The Spirit dispensation is ended, and without the power of the Spirit they could not be converted, and thus the means of salvation are withdrawn. That alone would make their status eternal.

The eye of every Christian should be fixed on the second coming of the Lord in view of the judgment that will follow that coming, and his heart should turn to the fact that with that day everything that goes wrong in time will be righted. I do not suppose that there was ever a man on earth, good or bad, but who some time or other in his life has asked for a general judgment in the world to come. Every wicked man will tell about certain wrongs he has suffered, and these wrongs here have never been righted, and the consciousness of his wrongs has made him appeal to the final arbitrament of their cases and to a decision that will be both righteous and inexorable.

There is here a thought of marvelous beauty to which I wish to call attention: "When He shall come to be glorified in His saints and to be marvelled at in all them that believed." The thought is that the power of any man and the benevolence of his intelligence are estimated by the greatest product of his mind and hand.

Sir Christopher Wren is glorified in Westminster Abbey, which was the greatest work of his genius, and as one steps into the abbey he passes under a sentence which reads, "Whoever wishes to see the monument of the architect, let him look around."

The illustration helps us to see what will be the character of the glory of Jesus Christ in His people. When He saw them they were utterly lost, their nature

depraved, under condemnation, without a friend, sinking down beneath the righteous frown of God. He came to save them, some of them drunkards, some of them whore-mongers, some robbers, some murderers, and commencing the good work in them by regeneration, and continuing it by sanctification, until their spirits were perfected, and consummating it by the resurrection and glorification of their bodies so that these that had been drunkards, liars, thieves, murderers, adulterers, stand there on that day in His own glorious image. Who did this? What mighty architect? It was Jesus. Jesus will be glorified in His people just as the sculptor will be glorified in the statue that comes from the skill of his hands and the thought of his mind. The sculptor looks on a piece of rough, unhewn marble, that a thousand people can see nothing in but marble, but with his eye of genius he sees in it the angel that can be carved from it. He begins to chip and chisel until at last form and outline appear. The rough outline assumes symmetry; the face takes on expression, the eyes seem to glow with fire, and as the finishing touch is put upon the statue, we marvel at the artist in his work. In that way Christ will be glorified in His people. This is the last thought in the first chapter.

QUESTIONS

1. What the occasion of the second letter to the Thessalonians, when and where written?
2. What the analysis of the letter, seriatim?
3. What new ground for thanksgiving?
4. What advance in the discussion of the second advent here?
5. How does the patient endurance of the Thessalonians under persecution become a token of a future and final judgment of God?
6. What does Paul teach in this letter as to the effect of Christ's coming on the wicked and the righteous?
7. What the teaching of our Lord on the same point?
8. What the teaching of Revelation on this same point?

9. What new matter for judgment relative to the angels?
10. What the nature of the judgment discussed here, and the proof?
11. What is the nature of the destiny of the wicked as revealed in this letter?
12. What the relation between God's love and the punishment of the wicked? Illustrate.
13. What tendency of human nature here pointed out? Illustrate.
14. What keeps men here on earth from becoming totally bad?
15. Why should the Christian have his eye fixed on the second coming of our Lord?
16. How will Christ at His second coming be glorified in His saints? Illustrate.

XI

THE SECOND COMING OF CHRIST AND THE MAN OF SIN

Scripture: II Thess. 2: 1, 2

IN the beginning of chapter 2 Paul says that the second coming of Christ is not only not at hand, but it is not even imminent: "Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand; let no man beguile you in any wise; for *it will not be,*" and then he goes on to tell what must precede it.

Upon that point I wish to speak very plainly. The second advent of our Lord Jesus Christ is the doctrine of the Christian's future, and a wrong belief about a doctrine cannot escape damage. There were good people when the promise was made about the first coming of Christ that expected it in their day. Eve thought that the Seed of the woman had come in the birth of Cain. Poor woman, how badly she was deceived! How far off it was till the coming of the Lord! Prophets and kings longed to see the day, and men lived and generations passed away, and governments underwent revolutions, and ages and ages rolled on, and not till the fulness of time, the time appointed, the very day set by Almighty

God, did Jesus Christ come the first time. Every predicted antecedent event had to precede it. So everything unrolled before the eye of the prophet touching any nation, any person, any church, any apostasy, any great religious movement, must come before Jesus can come the second time. Jesus said just before He went away that He would send the Holy Spirit, and they must wait until the Holy Spirit came. Was it possible for Him to come before that descent of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost? Jesus said to Peter, "You shall die on the cross." Could Peter then expect to see the coming of the Lord in his time? In the very letter where he is discussing the second coming of Christ, Peter says, "The Lord has shown me how I must put off this mortal body, and I think it is right as long as I am in it to stir your minds up to a remembrance of the teachings concerning the second coming of Jesus Christ." Then he goes on to tell the long series of events that must come first. Precisely in that way did Jesus, as recorded in Matthew 24, when the disciples crowded around and said, "Lord, what is the sign of thy coming and of the end of the world?" And Paul does just like Christ. Jesus says, "Let no man deceive you. There will come a great many false christs. There will be wars and rumors of wars. There will be earthquakes and fearful signs in the heavens. But this is only the beginning of things. The end is not yet." How careful He was to show them that they must not every morning, when they got up, look out of the window to see if Jesus had come. John fills the whole book of Revelation with a series of mighty events covering hundreds and even thousands of years that must take place before the coming of Jesus, and it does not make a particle of difference to us about our dying before He comes. One dying is better for it. His

soul gets to heaven quicker and his body gets to rest quicker.

Paul points out two stupendous events that must precede: "Except the falling away," or apostasy, comes first. Here was a marvelous turning away from sound principles of the gospel of Jesus Christ by professed Christians. That must take place first, and he says that the mystery of that thing was already at work; that is, there were men in his time that were beginning to deny certain fundamental doctrines of the gospel.

My own opinion is that this apostasy began to take definite form in the second and third centuries, and later ripened into the Papacy and culminated in the Pope in 1870. So we ourselves have a view of the apostasy, already prolonged more than a thousand years, and we are not to the end of it yet. We see the simplicity of the gospel changed, the engrafting on that simple gospel all of the types and shadows of the Old Testament, and mixing them with many heathen legends and customs, the union of church and state, the powerful organization called the scarlet woman seated upon the beast of seven heads, making herself drunk with the blood of the saints that she had slain. Nor has that apostasy yet reached its full fruition. How can it be possible for Jesus to come before that time? He has just said of that time, "the season and the hour are hidden from you."

But another marvelous event must precede our Lord's final advent—the revelation of the man of sin: "Let no man beguile you in any wise: for *it will not be,* except the falling away comes first, and the *man of sin will be revealed,* the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. Remember ye not, that when

I was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work: only there is one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of His coming." If I had proof that the man of sin was living I would know that Christ would come in the life-time of that man, because it is expressly declared that Jesus shall, at His coming, slay the man of sin.

This is one of the most mysterious passages in the Word of God, and on its interpretation, much as I have studied it, I will not assume to be dogmatic. I concede to anybody the privilege of differing with me about its meaning. Indeed, only the fulfillment itself when it comes can make plain and verify the true interpretation. The apostle is explaining why they should not expect the coming of the Lord Jesus Christ any time soon, and he assigns as the first reason that there must first come a great apostasy. That apostasy I have already discussed, but let us have the passage before us: "Now we beseech you, brethren, touching the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, and our gathering together unto Him; to the end that ye be not quickly shaken from your mind, nor yet be troubled, either by spirit, or by word, or by epistle as from us, as that the day of the Lord is just at hand; let no man beguile you in any wise: for *it will not be,* except the falling away come first, and the man of sin be revealed, the son of perdition, he that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God. Remember ye not, that when I

was yet with you, I told you these things? And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season. For the mystery of lawlessness doth already work: Only *there is* one that restraineth now, until he be taken out of the way. And then shall be revealed the lawless one, whom the Lord Jesus shall slay with the breath of His mouth, and bring to nought by the manifestation of His coming; *even he,* whose coming is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish; because they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be judged who believed not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness."

That is utterly unlike any other paragraph in the Bible. In the Old Testament there are some prophecies that are questionably construed to refer to the same thing, particularly Daniel 11:45, but in Revelation one passage at least connects in meaning with it, though it is symbolical language. But this passage here is literal, plain, straight-out prophecy. From the time these words were written by Paul until this hour this paragraph has perhaps excited more attention, called forth more discussion and developed a more voluminous literature than any other part of the Word of God. Indeed, every century has developed a special literature upon the subject, and many commentators devote a special excursus to it.

In the whole period of the Reformation it excited much attention, and by Protestants generally was construed to refer to the Romanish church and the papacy, but it is not possible, considering the context, to refer both II Thessalonians 2:4 and Revelation 13:1-8 to

the same person or institution. The importance of the subject is indicated by the persistent interest it has awakened and the controversies it has excited. One crucial fact differentiates this man of sin from all other antichrists: He will be alive when Jesus comes, and will be destroyed by the brightness of the Lord at His final advent. Another thing is certain—Jesus cannot come before that man of sin. In order to approach this subject properly, we need to consider other parts of the scripture leading up to it, which must be studied in connection with it, particularly Daniel, Matt. 24, and Revelation from the 13th to the 20th chapters, inclusive.

It is characteristic of prophecy to make a primary reference to an event forecast a more distant and important future event, and that event forecast a greater one beyond, just as the foot-hills between a spectator and a mountain-peak are merged into one view with the peak, and a still higher peak beyond blends with the same view as if all three constituted one peak. But as the spectator draws nearer, the widely separated parts differentiate, and each elevation is isolated from the one beyond. So is the perspective of prophecy. A prophecy may commence with Solomon and then pass on to David's greater Son, our Lord himself.

In the prophetic scriptures appear four great antichrists with characteristics so similar that they have been hopelessly confused by most interpreters. The person so forecast is never the same in any two instances, but each foreshadows his successor. Certain characteristics belong to all, which blend the view as if all were one. But as the first becomes historical, we see there is a greater one beyond, and so on through the series. Two of these persons have already become historical, and two are yet to come, the climax being the last, which is Paul's

man of sin. Anticipating the argument, I name the four in order:

1. Antiochus Epiphanes, Daniel 8:9-12, the little horn of the Greek empire.

2. The papacy, Daniel 8:8, 23-25, the little horn of the divided and changed Roman empire. In Revelation he is the beast that looked like a lamb, but had a voice like a dragon, Rev. 13:11, who was developed out of the heathen Roman empire after it, and who, by union of Church and State, became "The Holy Roman Empire," Rev. 13:1-10.

3. The secular ruler who seeks to destroy the Jews after their restoration to the Holy Land, Daniel 11:36-45; Zech. 14:1-11; Revelation 19:11-21; Isa. 63:1-6. This conversion puts the Jews in the lead as an evangelizing force, and ushers in the Millennium, Isa. 66:7-24; Zech. 14:16-21; Rev. 20:1-6.

4. Paul's Man of Sin, the last device of Satan after the Millennium, II Thess. 2:3-12 and Rev. 20:7-10. His destruction is brought about by our Lord's final advent, to wind up the affairs of time, II Thess. 2:8; Matt. 24:29-31 and 25:31-46; Rev. 20:11-15. Something of the details of the argument is this:

1. All the subsequent visions of Daniel are based on Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great, luminous image whose head was gold, whose chest and arms were silver, whose body and thighs were brass, and whose lower limbs were iron, which was destroyed by the little stone cut out of the mountain without hands (Dan. 2:31-35), and which was interpreted to mean five great world-empires in succession, namely: the Babylonian, the Medo-Persian, the Greek, the Roman and the kingdom of God.

2. The vision of the great tree in Daniel 4 gives a development of the head of gold under a new imagery.

3. The vision of the four beasts in Daniel 7 presents under a different imagery the same four secular world-empires with elaborations concerning the fourth not before given, and passes on to present the ascension and exaltation of one like a Son of man, who is the King of the fifth world-empire, and receives an everlasting dominion. This elaborates the little-stone-kingdom of Daniel 2.

4. The vision of chapter 8 presents under different images the details of the Medo-Persian Empire, and the Greek Empire after its division into four kingdoms.

5. The revelation in Dan. 9:24-27 dates the first advent of the King of the fifth world-empire, His life and vicarious death, as Daniel 7 shows His exaltation and enthronement after His resurrection.

6. The vision in Daniel 10 is the same King in the glory of His royal priesthood as John saw Him on Patmos, Rev. 1:13-18.

7. Dan. 11:1-33 describes the conflict between the Syrian and Egyptian divisions of the Greek empire, with a distinct climax and pause at verse 33, while from verse 34 to the end of the chapter is a transition to the third antichrist—a vile person who worshipped only the god of forces. It is this person who embodies the atheism of modern evolution, a spirit already gaining strength in the world, and which is utterly godless. His reign is characterized by an absence of all reverence, and is dominated by a radical spirit of commercialism, materialism and of mechanical and natural forces. He it is that seeks to blot out the Jewish people, and is destroyed by mighty displays of that supernatural power the very idea of whose existence he had scorned. It may not be a long time before he materializes. The trend of modern events forecasts his speedy coming. The coming of the Lord

which destroys him is not a personal coming, but a coming in marvelous judgments, as at the destruction of Jerusalem. With him atheism, materialism and godless commercialism forever die.

8. In Dan. 12:1-3 there is either a transition to the final and personal advent of the Lord, with a literal resurrection, or as is more probable, the paragraph is the climax of the preceding event with its figurative resurrections, as in Ezek. 37 and in Rev. 20:1-6. In the latter and more probable sense, Daniel sees only the ultimate glory of the Jewish people in millennial days, and has no vision of Paul's man of sin.

The similar characteristics of the four antichrists appear by comparing what is said of each. Of Antiochus Epiphanes, the little horn of the third, or Grecian, empire, it is said: "And out of one of them came a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the glorious land. And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and some of the host and of the stars it cast down to the ground, and trampled upon them. Yea, it magnified itself, even to the prince of the host; and it took away from him the continual burnt-offering, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. And the host was given over to it together with the continual burnt-offering through transgression; and it cast down truth to the ground, and it did its pleasure and prospered," Dan. 8:9-12. Of the papacy, or little horn of the fourth, or Roman empire, it is said, "And he shall speak words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High; and he shall think to change the times and the law; and they shall be given unto his hand until a time and times and half a time," Dan. 7:25. "And there was given to him authority to continue forty and two months. And

he opened his mouth for blasphemies against God, to blaspheme His name, and His tabernacle, even them that dwell in heaven. And it was given him to make war with the saints, and to overcome them; and there was given to him authority over every tribe and people and tongue and nation. And all that dwell on the earth shall worship him, every one whose name hath not been written from the foundation of the world in the book of life of the Lamb that hath been slain," Rev. 13:5-8.

Of the atheistic, secular ruler who seeks to destroy the Jews, it is said, "And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvelous things against the God of gods; and he shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that which is determined shall be done. Neither shall he regard the gods of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god; for he shall magnify himself above all. But in his place shall he honor the god of fortresses; and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold, and silver, and with precious stones and pleasant things. And he shall deal with strongest fortresses with the help of a foreign god; whosoever acknowledgeth him he will increase with glory; and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for a price," Dan. 11:36-39. Of Paul's man of sin is said, "He that opposeth and exalteth himself against all that is called God or that is worshipped; so that he sitteth in the temple of God, setting himself forth as God," II Thess. 2:4. We see thus how in the perspective of prophecy, before any one of them became historical, all may so blend into one view as to appear to be one, each so strikingly forecasting his more towering successor. The similarity of characteristics arises from a common origin.

They have one father, the devil, who, while possessing a few original ideas, is a past master in variety of labels and costumes.

Passing now from the consideration of all preceding antichrists, let us analyze what is taught concerning Paul's man of sin:

1. He is a *person,* and not a principle, nor an institution.

2. He will be alive at the final coming of the Lord. This one crucial fact differentiates him from all other antichrists, and makes it impossible to find him in history.

3. And since he is Satan's last agent, making the last play of evil for the destruction of God's kingdom, as is evident from his being alive and at work when the Lord comes, he cannot be located in any period before the millennium.

4. This is further evident from the restraint put upon Satan, in trying to bring him to the front, until God's appointed season. It is idle to talk of the heathen-Rome-resurrection, since that power passed away more than a thousand years ago, and the man of sin has not yet appeared. God himself, directly or indirectly, is restrainer. And we recognize the restraint as we see Satan bound for a thousand years in order to introduce the millennium. He has successfully deceived the nations in bringing out and giving power to the first and second antichrists, and will again deceive them, and that soon, in bringing out and empowering the third and atheistic antichrist. But the prophecy says, "And I saw an angel coming down out of heaven, having the key of the abyss and a great chain in his hand. And he laid hold on the dragon, the old serpent, which is the devil and Satan, and bound him for a thousand years, and cast him into the abyss, and shut it, and sealed it over him, that he

should deceive the nations no more, until the thousand years should be finished; after this he must be loosed a little time," Rev. 20:1-3.

In that long period the saints are on top, and the kingdoms of the world have become the kingdom of our Lord. The knowledge of the Lord will overspread the world as the waters cover the deep. Satan bound cannot deceive the nations nor palm off his impostures. And even when he is loosed from that restraint, it is only for a little season. Here, and here only, in this little season after the millennium, can appear the man of sin, who will be alive when the Lord comes, and be destroyed by the brightness of His appearing.

5. Paul says, "the coming of this son of perdition, this lawless one, is according to the working of Satan with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceit of unrighteousness for them that perish; because they received not the love of the truth, that they might be saved. And for this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie: that they all might be judged who believe not the truth, but had pleasure in unrighteousness." Evidently this is Satan's masterpiece of imposture, and by far the most highly accredited. Here we behold the depths of Satan.

6. But what most strikingly impresses the mind is not Satan's originality of device, but his imitative power. This is more evident in the original Greek-text than in any translation. But it is evident even in the translation:

(a) As Christ's kingdom has a mystery of godliness, so Satan's kingdom has a mystery of lawlessness.

(b) As Christ's kingdom has an energy of the Holy Spirit, so Satan's has an energy of his malignant spirit.

(c) As Christ's kingdom was accredited by signs,

wonders, powers and works, so Satan's is accredited by all these.

(d) As Christ's kingdom is received by faith, so Satan's requires belief: the first, however, is the belief of the truth, while the second is the belief of a lie.

(e) As Christ's kingdom has a pleasure in holiness (Greek—*eudokia*), so Satan's subjects find a pleasure in unrighteousness.

(f) As the King of the divine kingdom is a human person, so here in the prophecy Satan's kingdom enthrones a human vicegerent.

(g) As the Messiah of God's kingdom had a first coming (*elthe*) and will have a manifestation (*parousia*) or second coming, so both terms are applied to the person of Satan's man of sin. These terms lead up to the most startling characteristic of Paul's man of sin.

(h) As Christ's first coming (*elthe*) was an incarnation in human nature by the Holy Spirit, so this man of sin will be an incarnation by Satan. He will be the devil incarnate.

(i) And as Christ will appear in glory at His final advent (*parousia*), so this devil incarnate will seek to anticipate Christ's *parousia* by a counterfeit manifestation. In other words, he will claim to be the long expected Messiah. No other wile or depth of Satan equals this. The millennial world will have reached the final advent, and will have prayed, "Come, Lord Jesus," and will be expecting the advent of the Judge.

Recognizing this expectation as good ground for the sowing of evil seed, and himself dreading that final advent, Satan introduces his man of sin as the long expected Messiah, and accredits him with all manner of signs, wonders, and works. It will be as if he said, "Hear, you expectant world! Your Messiah has come!

O Church or temple of God, receive your Lord! O bride, long waiting, behold the bridegroom!" Through his miracles he will deceive all but the elect, and he will lead his dupes to a final assault on the true churches which refuse to accept him. It is then that the sign of the real Christ appears in the heavens, namely, the great white throne of judgment. It is then that our Lord himself appears in glory, and all the holy angels with Him. Then is fulfilled: "And when the thousand years are finished, Satan shall be loosed out of his prison, and shall come forth to deceive the nations which are in the four corners of the earth, Gog and Magog, to gather them together to the war: the number of whom is as the sand of the sea. And they went up over the breadth of the earth, and compassed the camp of the saints about, and the beloved city: and fire came down out of heaven, and devoured them. And the devil that deceived them was cast into the lake of fire and brimstone, where are also the beast and the false prophet; and they shall be tormented day and night for ever and ever," Rev. 20:7-10.

There are just two more thoughts in connection with the man of sin which I will discuss briefly. In the account of the man of sin we have these two expressions in chapter 2: "And now ye know that which restraineth, to the end that he may be revealed in his own season," and, "Only *there* is one that restraineth now, until he [the restrainer] be taken out of the way." In other words, the man of sin cannot come until the one who has been restraining him is taken away. Now, what or who is it that restrains him?

I frankly confess that I do not know satisfactorily to myself. But I can tell you what commentators, wiser than myself, have said from the days of Paul to the present time. They say that the restraining power which

kept down the mystery of lawlessness, and the consequent development of the man of lawlessness, or sin was the Roman power. The imperial government of Rome stood for order, and it ruled the world with an iron hand, and anywhere in the world that anything like disintegration or sedition or tumult or lawlessness in any form appeared, there is where the Roman thunderbolt struck. That is the general opinion of commentators. We do know that after this Roman power was removed, the Roman empire collapsed. You will find a history of it in Gibbon's "Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire," and as that great central power went down, everywhere in the world men sprang up, prompted by a spirit of lawlessness, and there was no such reign of disorder in the history of the world as came after the downfall of the Roman empire.

That is what the most intelligent commentators say, but it is not satisfactory to me, because that restraint has been taken away for many hundred years and the man of sin has not yet appeared. It seems more reasonable that God himself, either directly or through intermediary agents, is the restraining power, and will keep on restraining until the appointed time. While that does not thoroughly satisfy me, it does satisfy me so much better than the one that the commentators give that I cannot accept theirs. The impression is that the one inspired of lawlessness would appear in a moment but for a pressure—a restraining power—and when that is taken away, then the man of sin will appear.

While I am on my opinion (and I give it as an opinion, but as a reasonable one), it is evident that in the millennial period the restraining power will be put on the devil. He will be bound for a thousand years, and there will be a great tide of revivalism such as the world

never heard of, for a thousand years. So long as that chain is on Satan he cannot develop his man of sin; but the account in Revelation says that after the thousand years is ended, Satan will be loosed, so there the restraining power is taken off, and then appears the last master stroke of the devil. I am standing on that interpretation.

The other thought is this: "For this cause God sendeth them a working of error, that they should believe a lie." The men who turn away from God are sure to believe something worse than that from which they turn away, and they have not the liberty of choosing the delusion of error into which they fall, and the devil cannot choose it for them. God chooses it. He permits the devil to work it off on them, but the devil himself cannot arbitrarily select the kind of foolishness with which to fool the people that are to be lost.

QUESTIONS

1. According to this letter, is the second coming of Christ imminent?
2. Prove this from the analogy of His first coming.
3. What did Jesus say would come before His second coming?
4. What two great events, according to II Thessalonians, must precede the second advent of our Lord?
5. What the great apostasy?
6. What crucial fact differentiates the man of sin from all other antichrists?
7. What is characteristic of prophecy relative to a great future event? Illustrate.
8. Following this line of thought, who the four antichrists, and what the time of the appearance of each?
9. What in outline are the details of the argument?
10. Cite the Daniel-passage referring to the first antichrist, and show in order of time how he is distinguished from the other antichrists.
11. Quote the Daniel-passage which gives him the typical characteristics of Paul's man of sin.
12. Cite the Daniel-passage that foreshadows the second antichrist.
13. How, in order of time, is he distinguished from the first?

14. Quote the Daniel-passage, giving him also the typical characteristics of Paul's man of sin.
15. Identify in Revelation Daniel's second antichrist.
16. What the Daniel-passage for the third antichrist, and what other scriptures touching him?
17. What his characteristics in the Daniel-reference?
18. What spirit of modern times does he embody, and what forever dies with him?
19. On what murderous mission is he engaged when destruction overtakes him?
20. What glorious events follow, and what scriptures refer to each of them?
21. What the nature of the coming of the Lord which defeats him, and just where is this great battle to be fought?
22. What six facts of revelation concerning Paul's man of sin or the fourth antichrist?
23. Just where in the Book of Revelation must Paul's man of sin come in?
24. In what is the wonderful imitative power of Paul's man of sin evident, even in the translation?
25. What furnishes a good ground for Satan's deception in this, his last effort to defeat our Lord Jesus Christ?
26. What stupendous events immediately follow, and what scripture will then be fulfilled.
27. How do commentators interpret the "restraining power" (II Thess. 2:6, 7) that keeps back the revelation of the man of sin until the appointed season?
28. Why is this explanation inadequate?
29. Supply a better interpretation, and give scripture proof.
30. What the interpretation of "God sendeth them a working of error, etc.?"

XII

THE PLAN OF SALVATION—SOME LESSONS ON DISCIPLINE

Scripture: II Thess. 2:13—3:18.

WE shall close this second letter to the Thessalonians by presenting four thoughts that follow a consideration of the man of sin.

I. Paul's plan of salvation. It is expressed in these words, chapter 2:13, 14: "But we are bound to give thanks to God always for you, brethren beloved of the Lord, for that God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth: whereunto He called you through our gospel, to the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ."

Once I was talking to a distinguished theologian who has had much to do with the teaching of the Word of God to collegiates, and I asked him how he developed the analytic power in his students, and then I read this well-ordered plan of salvation. Let us reduce it to its constituent elements. Confining ourselves to what is here, let us see what God's plan is:

1. "God chose you." What then is the first element of the plan? Election.

2. "From the beginning." When did He choose you? In eternity.

3. Unto what did He choose you? Salvation.

4. What the means? "Through sanctification of the

Spirit and belief of the truth," *i. e.,* that through which we get to salvation is faith in the gospel and the renovating power of the Holy Spirit.

5. "Whereunto," that is, unto these things that have just been said, "He calls you." There is the calling of God.

6. How did He call you? "Through the gospel." Away back yonder in eternity, God chose a man, and we do not know anything about it. Down here in time God calls the man that He chose. How does He do it? Some day that man hears a gospel sermon preached, and the Holy Spirit reaches his heart just as if a voice said to him, "Come to me! Come to me now!" That is His call.

7. What is the object of the calling? "To the obtaining of the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ." Christ was glorified when He was raised from the dead and exalted to His place at the right hand of God in heaven. When He calls us, He calls us unto that glory; that where Jesus is, we may be; that what Jesus is we shall be; that the power that Jesus exercises we shall exercise; that what Jesus inherits, we shall inherit.

That is the plan of salvation in these two verses—election from eternity, unto salvation, in sanctification of the Spirit and belief of the truth, called in Him through the gospel and the work of the Spirit unto the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ.

II. The prayer that Paul asked those people to offer for him. We get so accustomed to saying, "pray for me," that we do not mean it, and the people who say, "yes, I will," do not mean it. Paul never asked that unmeaningly, and he always knew exactly what he wanted them to pray for in his behalf. He put great stress upon the prayers of God's people for the preachers.

Now, *we in our greatness* may not need such things, but the *little apostle* was bound to have it. He felt that he could not get along unless God's people lovingly and earnestly prayed for him.

The preacher goes out in his self-sufficiency, thinking that he has the world in a sling, and that he can do like Brother J. B. Jeter and Jesse Witt, who were employed by Virginia as missionaries. Riding along two and two, they came to an old log church and saw a great many horses hitched. Concluding that there was a religious service, they went in and heard the sermon. The first thing people say on leaving a church is, "What do you think of that sermon?" So as these two preachers stepped out, Jeter says to Witt, "What do you think of that sermon?" Witt modestly said, "Well, Brother Jeter, I am not much, but I do believe, that by the help of the Lord, I could beat that sermon myself." Jeter responded, "I could beat it, Lord or no Lord." When the young preacher or Christian goes out into his work with perfect confidence that he can do a thing, "Lord or no Lord," whether the brethren sympathize with him and pray for him or not, he makes a mistake.

In the days of my pastorate there were two or three people, particularly two old ladies, that when I felt very much depressed and my mind was dark, and I could not determine just what to preach about nor how to say it, and Saturday night had come, I would step over to see one or the other of these old ladies and state my case, and I would say, "Now, you pray for me." The solemnity with which either one of them would listen to what I said, the tenderness with which they would talk to me, and the suggestions they would make would be such that when I would leave that house I would have a sermon, and I would know how to preach.

Here is what Paul asked for, "Finally, brethren, pray for us, that the word of the Lord may run and be glorified, even as also it is with you." That preaching at Thessalonica was the most successful preaching Paul ever did, and he always wanted to do as well somewhere else; that the word might have free course. Compare that prayer with one like this: "Lord, I have to preach next Sunday before a crowd of critical people; I need a new spotted cravat; I would like to have a mince pie for dinner, and I would like to know where I am to get my winter suit." Notice what he asked for. This is the thing on Paul's mind—not eating, clothing, wordly honor, or money, but that the Word of the Lord that he preached might have free course and be glorified. In other words, "Just let me do as well as I did at Thessalonica." Sometimes a failure does more good than a success.

I knew an old Baptist preacher—one of our early missionaries here in Texas. Sometimes he would get upon a mountain-top, and at other times he would be "snowed." I have sympathized with him in the midst of a great revival meeting when he realized what a miserable failure he had made. Once he said, "Brethren, my mind is dark tonight; I am not using this great occasion for the Lord; pray for me." There was a wave of sympathy produced by the modesty and humility of the man that would so tenderly and so pathetically confess his failure. There were more conversions that night than any other night in the meeting.

The next thing that Paul prayed is that he might be delivered from unreasonable men. The greatest thorn that a preacher can confront is an unreasonable man, or woman. Just one obstinate, fussy man in a community can block the way of angels. He is the toughest propo-

sition that ever the aspiring mind of man attempted to dispose of. Paul knew all about it, and he wanted to be delivered from that class of men. Then from unreasonableness there was wickedness. One sinner can do much evil. One man can go around the outskirts of a meeting and whisper and slander and sneer and suggest, and almost break up the meeting. He says, "For all have not faith."

J. M. Pendleton made that his favorite text, and what a sermon he could preach from it! When he got to be an old man he visited his daughter, Mrs. Waggoner, wife of the president of the State University. I had read different sermons of his on that text. But I paid his expenses and gave him $20 to come to Waco and preach a new sermon on the same text. It was a great sermon—one that I shall never forget.

I have seen brethren get down in a meeting and pray that the meeting would not close until every man, woman and child in the community had been converted. That does not happen, "for all people have not faith," and if we stopped at a place until we led everybody in that place to Christ before we go anywhere else, we would never move.

III. A case of discipline: Chapter 3:6: "Now we command you, brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye withdraw yourselves from every brother that walketh disorderly, and not after the tradition which they received of us." That is just as positive and binding as if Jesus Christ in person had commanded it. "If a member of any church will not walk in the gospel which has been preached by the Holy Spirit sent down from heaven, and has a fixed standard of his own, and won't make the gospel the rule of his life, and stubbornly goes against it, then we command you brethren

in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, to withdraw from that man."

One of the greatest evils in the world today is the lack of scriptural discipline in the churches.

A great many country churches have a great deal of discipline; much of it is very injudicious and unscriptural. A great many city churches have no discipline at all; they just let things wag along. They would not take up a case of drunkenness, of audacious murder, of awful fraud, though the whole cause of Jesus Christ be suffering from the lack of scriptural discipline, and if I had to mention today wherein the ministry is most deficient, I would instantly put my finger upon discipline. First, they do not know what it is. Second, they do not know how to manage it. Third, when they find out they are afraid of it.

Let us look into this case of discipline: Paul appeals first to his teaching, next to his example: "You know my example; I never walked disorderly. I was guilty of no deceit, covetousness, or uncleanness. Boldly, justly, unblamably I lived among you when I was preaching to you. There you have my teaching and my example. Now, you have my commands."

Let us see at what particular point this disorder came in. We want to know exactly the nature of the offence. First, some of them would not work; they were lazy dead-beats, hanging around, living off the brethren. That is an awful sin. Paul saw that unless he could impress upon these people the dignity of honest labor—no matter what kind of labor, whether honest work with a wheelbarrow, cutting wood, plowing, spinning, weaving, cooking, washing, it is honorable, and that there is a dignity and majesty about labor—then religion would lose the respect of the honest and industrious. Second, they

were busybodies. Of course, an idle man is bound to have some business; a man that has no work to do is bound to be working at something, and if he is idle, then he will move around and do a great deal of talking. He will be busy about somebody else's business.

Paul knew some women of that kind, as we find in a subsequent letter. He tells Timothy that they were tattlers and gad-abouts. When once the tongues get to wagging and buzzing and humming in a community, then the archangel and a legion of his angels could not pick up the evil impressions as fast as they can sow them. They had idle people at Thessalonica. Most of these people were poor, hardworking people, and here was a lot of fellows that would put their hands in their vest pockets (if they had any vest) and talk about the glories of the coming of Christ, and they were filling their souls with the anticipation of Christ coming down, and they did not want such a thing as working for a day's victuals to come between them and their joyful reflections.

John Wesley was once asked: "Mr. Wesley, if you knew that Jesus Christ was coming to-morrow night, what would you do?" He said, "I would go right along filling my appointments for to-morrow up to the time. When He comes I would like for Him to find me working just that way."

These men thought it a mark of superior Christianity that they should so retire from all occupation as to contemplate in pious, sweet meditation the second coming of Christ. It is a glorious theme to meditate about, but never quit doing a duty to meditate about anything.

Let us look further into this case. He says, "Brethren, you remember when we were with you, this we commanded you, if any will not work, neither let him eat.

For we hear of some that walk among you disorderly, that work not at all, but are busy-bodies." Here is his command to the disorderly: "We command and exhort in Jesus Christ that with quietness they work, and eat their own bread." But if they wouldn't, here is the injunction to the church: "If any man obeyeth not our word by this epistle, note that man, that ye have no company with him, to the end that he may be ashamed."

I have never yet seen that kind of corrective discipline. He says if there is a man who is walking disorderly (and he mentions what he calls disorderly walking), don't let him partake of the Lord's supper. As he says elsewhere, "with such a one, no, not to eat." That is not turning him out of the church. Let a man of that kind see good men not wishing for his company; not rudely, but quietly turning away from him; it makes an impression on him. He sees that he is shunned by those who discountenance his disorderly methods.

Look again at the discipline: Why should they not keep company with them? It is to bring him to be ashamed of himself. But we are not through with it yet: "Count him not as an enemy, but admonish him as a brother." The idea in most of the country churches is, "I move that we turn him out." That leaves out a wide scope of corrective discipline, of laboring discipline, of faithful dealing with brethren.

IV. Paul's authorship. In the last verse it is written: "The salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand, which is the token in every epistle, so I write." That proves, first, what is elsewhere so frequently asserted, that Paul was not accustomed to writing his letters. He dictated them. He suffered from acute ophthalmia, or to put it in plainer English, sore eyes. And when he wrote he made great sprawling letters. He wrote only one of his

letters with his own hand, and that was the letter to the Galatians, and he called their attention to it: "You see with what sprawling letters I have written to you." Inasmuch as his custom was to dictate his letters, when he heard that the Thessalonians were reporting that they had seen a letter from Paul that said that Christ was coming right away, Paul says, "I wrote no such letter." And to guard against imposition upon the minds of his churches, coming from forged letters, as soon as he found out that a letter had been forged in his name, he adopted the expedient here of attesting his letters. "Now, hereafter you will know whether a letter is from me thus: 'The salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand; so I write.'" In other words, "When a man says he has a letter from me, you look to see if it has my signature. If I dictate a letter my signature will be there to show that it is really a letter from me." That is the token of the Pauline epistles. And it is only in the letter to the Hebrews that he did not do it, and I will tell you why he did not follow his custom and append his name to that letter when we come to it.

QUESTIONS

1. On II Thess. 2:13, 14, answer: (1) What the first constituent element of salvation? (2) When did God choose them? (3) Unto what did He choose them? (4) Through what? (5) How made effectual? (6) Through what did He call? (7) What the object of His calling?
2. What the meaning of "the glory of our Lord Jesus Christ?"
3. In 3:1, 2 what two things does Paul ask the brethren in his behalf?
4. What may we infer as to our need of the prayers of our brethren, and the suitable objects of prayer?
5. What illustration of self-sufficiency given?
6. What the meaning of "all have not faith?"
7. What the case of discipline in 3:6, and what the greatest deficiency of the ministry today?
8. What three reasons assigned for this deficiency?

9. To what two things does Paul appeal in this case of discipline?

10. What the nature of the offense?

11. What was the general topic of discussion among these people, and how does Wesley's program illustrate the contrary idea?

12. What remedy did Paul propose for the case?

13. What should be the attitude of the church toward one who is subject to corrective discipline?

14. What bearing has 3:14 on the extent of apostolic authority and the inspiration of the letter?

15. What the proof from this letter that Paul found it necessary to attest his letters with his own signature; why did he usually dictate his letters to an amanuensis, and which one of his letters was written altogether in his own handwriting?

THE BOOK OF FIRST CORINTHIANS

XIII

INTRODUCTION

THE first group of Paul's letters is I and II Thessalonians, and the great theme of those letters is eschatology, or the doctrine of the last things, particularly the second coming of Christ. The next group is I and II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans—these great letters that brought immortality for their author from any standpoint, whether in literature, logic or pathos. In argument and in power of persuasion they have no equal in the world's literature. This discussion will be a general introduction to the Corinthian literature.

Let us locate Corinth on the map of the Roman empire, and state the advantages of its position. The reader will notice the little neck of land connecting the Peloponnesus, or lower Greece, with Macedonia and Thrace, or upper Greece, an isthmus between the two seas. The port on the east side was Cenchrea, where Phœbe was converted, and where a church was established. The city is on a rock over 200 feet above the sea level, and on a hill over 1,600 feet higher is the citadel, or *Akro-Korinthos*. In the study of history we find that straits and isthmuses are the world's strategic points. More exploring of them is done, more fighting for them and attempts to hold mastery of them than for any other

parts of the world. As the Isthmus of Suez, or Panama in modern times, so in the ancient world was the famous isthmus commanded by the city of Corinth.

The advantages of the position are evident. First, it commands the passage-way from Macedonia, Achia and Thrace into the Peloponnesus, or lower Greece. It was dangerous navigation around the lower points of the Peloponnesus, hence, merchants would take their ships to this isthmus, where there was a way to drag the ships across to the other sea—a crude ship railroad. On a very crude scale great conquerors have imitated this transportation of ships by land. Cortes, when he conquered the City of Mexico, had his ships taken to pieces and transported over the high mountain ranges and launched in Lake Tezcuco, which was on the east side of the city. So, the position of Corinth made it a place of international importance.

Old classic Greek tells about Sparta and Athens—Athens the intellectual and political head, and Sparta the military head of the Greek world. Corinth contended, neither in intellect with Athens, nor in martial spirit, with Sparta. It devoted itself to commerce, so that the Lacedæmonians rebuked them for worshiping the almighty dollar. When the Spartan power fell before Philip of Macedon, the father of Alexander the Great, these great cities—Athens and Sparta—decayed. Corinth came to the front, and was the chief city of Greece under Philip and Alexander, his son. It was a city of great importance until the Roman general captured and destroyed it. It lay desolate for over a hundred years. Julius Cæsar, the first Roman emperor, then rebuilt it.

Rome conferred great privileges on it, by making it a free city. At the time of Christ it was one of the most important cities in the world. Here the Isthmian games

constituted the glory of all the world, so that Corinth was "Vanity Fair." Corinth was Paris; Corinth was London. There was the temple of Aphrodite, or Venus, who was the chief goddess worshiped, and one thousand maidens were selected to be the debauched servants of that infamous temple. As a great writer has said, "With all of its intellectual culture, wealth and luxury, Corinth rotted morally." No place on earth was more debauched. They worshiped their gods with the most shameful orgies of obscenity and vice. It was while Paul was there, knowing the degradation of the heathen countries, and particularly of their worship, that he wrote that terrible indictment contained in Romans 1, where he describes the corruption of the heathen nations who had no knowledge of God.

The Jews, of course, came on account of its commercial advantages. About the time that Paul got there, there was an unusual number of Jews in Corinth, because the Roman emperor had just banished them from Rome. Aquila and Priscilla, that noted Christian man and wife, had just come from Rome under that decree, and were living in Corinth. The Greeks, of course, were there, and there were vast multitudes of Romans. There were more slaves than in any other place in proportion to the population. Many slaves were among Paul's converts.

The city was seemingly covered with gold. They had an artificial finish that they gave their buildings which in the light of the sun would make the whole building seem to be of gold. The Corinthian brass was of great commercial value. The style of architecture, called the Corinthian, is the most ornate of all the styles of architecture now in the world. So, for intellectual development, architectural skill, athletic skill, athletic culture,

skill of navigation, great wealth and great luxury, this city was renowned. It is not very much of a place now.

The greatest celebrity of this city was the *Akro-Korinthos*—the citadel. One could stand on that citadel and see Athens across the sea. Another was the Isthmian games, then the worship of Aphrodite and her temple. Cicero called Corinth "the eye of Greece." Another Roman author called it the capital and the grace of Greece. A Roman proverb was, "It becomes every man to go to Corinth," just as we say in modern times, "See Naples and die."

We gather the history of the establishment of the church in this city from Acts 18: 1-18, the Letters to the Corinthians, and then the Letter to the Philippians. There are some expressions of value also in the Letter to the Romans.

Let us now give a summary of the history of the establishment of that church. With the Acts before us, and Goodwin's "Harmony of Paul," we will have no trouble. Briefly, Paul had visited Athens after he left Berea. That is the only time he tried to preach an eloquent sermon, and quote from heathen poets, and scatter a little star-dust over the crowd. It is the only place where he ever failed, and he never tried that any more. He was very sore over the result of his work in Athens, and so in about six hours' sail he passed from Athens to Corinth. He took a boat to Cenchrea, and walked the other ten miles. When he got there he moved among the Jews until he found Aquila and Priscilla, that remarkable Christian family that had a great deal to do with his subsequent history. He had no money. He was by himself, sick all the time, nearly blind, and worked day and night with them to make a living while he did his preaching.

He preached first in the synagogue there. His object, as in all other synagogues, was to show that the Jewish Messiah was to be a suffering Messiah, and that Jesus of Nazareth was that Messiah. As usual there were some converts among them, and particularly among the Jewish proselytes. Crispus, the leader of the synagogue, with all his house, was converted. The rest of the Jews blasphemed horribly, and opposed him, so that he drew a line of demarkation, as he did at Ephesus a little later. Hard by the synagogue was a man named Justus, a proselyte, who had been converted. Paul held his meetings at his house. Then he began to preach to the Gentiles. On every side of him were slaves with human masters and slaves of long-continued drunkenness. A vast number of Paul's converts were drunkards, thieves, liars and murderers. He tells them that when he writes to them. He determines not to try the Athenian method of preaching. He determined to go before them in fear and trembling, to rely only on and to glory in nothing but the cross of Christ, and to pray as he preached that their faith should stand in the power of God, and God most wonderfully accompanied with power the preaching of this man.

There were not only vast numbers converted, but great multitudes were baptized in the Spirit, receiving that Pentecostal baptism, the power to speak with tongues, to heal the sick, to raise the dead, to discern spirits. That house of Justus became very famous. There were marvelous displays of divine power there. Here was a man who had been an abject slave, speaking in unknown tongues. Here a cripple made whole in a moment, and himself having the power to heal others. Here was every display of spiritual *Charismata.* As he says in I Corinthians: "What is it then, brethren? When ye

come together, each one hath a psalm, hath a teaching, hath a revelation, hath a tongue, hath an interpretation." There never was any church that received the miraculous gift of the Spirit more than this first church at Corinth.

The difficulties were very great. Timothy and Silas joined him, and even then one night Paul—the great Paul—got scared. He seemed to be so lonely, and there was that awful unconsecrated wealth, the fearful debauchery of their religious worship, the "Vanity Fair" of their Isthmian games—and Paul got scared. But that night his Lord came to him in a vision and said, "Be not afraid, but speak and hold not thy peace, for I am with thee and no man shall set on thee to harm thee, for I have much people in this city." All the fear left his heart and under the realization of the sense of the presence of the Lord Jesus Christ, he forgot everything human and earthly. His faith took hold of every divine promise. His hope soared up to heaven. His love radiated its light and heat like the sun. There seemed to him nothing impossible, and great multitudes were converted.

Oh, when we go out to preach in a corrupt city, a worldly-minded city, given over to the acquisition of the almighty dollar, where the boys and girls are living lives of debauchery and shame, and we are there by ourselves, and begin to get scared, then we need only to have a meeting with the Lord Jesus Christ. That is the secret of power.

And whatever we do, when we go to a place like that, let us not try the oratorical method. But let us get low before God and hold up the cross. Then we ourselves won't be able to take in the fulness of the blessing God will send upon us. If we take hold of a great enterprise, if we have a spark of reason left in us, let us

remember that if the work is of God, and it is right to do it—if it ought to be done, and we feel impressed that we are the ones to do it, and we want to win, we can win only by the realization that the Lord Jesus Christ is with us.

About this time the new Roman proconsul arrived. All provinces under the Roman senate were governed by a proconsul. This new man is known among the preachers as Gallio.

One of the first things I ever heard in a public service was a Baptist man praying, and he said, "Lord let us not be like Gallio, caring for none of these things." I heard that until I got the idea that Gallio was indifferent to religion. But he was one of the sweetest characters in Roman history, a brother of Seneca, and devoted to justice. When the Jews arrested Paul and preferred charges against him, and Paul got up to speak, Gallio stopped him: "You need not make a speech, Paul; I will quash this indictment. This does not come before a Roman court." He told his lictors to scatter the Jews out of the house. I wonder if Gallio ever thought that he missed hearing a message of eternal life when he dismissed the case without hearing Paul's defense. I wonder if he ever supposed that he and his brother, Seneca, and all men like him, great and mighty in the Roman world, would live in history simply because at one point their lives touched Paul's. After the Jews were driven away, the street rabble decided that they would lynch a few Jews, since the governor held them in such contempt. They beat Sosthenes, and it was this treatment of the Jews about which Gallio cared nothing.

Paul stayed there a year and a half, preaching in all the regions round about. He established churches, not only at Corinth but in other places. When he made a

visit, on his third tour, to Ephesus, he came back to Corinth for a little while, but we have no history of it except a vague allusion in one of his letters. Then, he wrote a letter to the Corinthians that is lost, for he himself says, "I wrote unto you not to keep company with fornicators." Not everything that Moses, Paul or any other Bible writer wrote did the Holy Spirit think necessary to preserve.

Paul began to hear some strange reports about Corinth. He had been at Ephesus for a year or two. At last a delegation of the people that he had baptized came to bring him a letter from the church at Corinth, inviting him to come over, paying a good deal of adulation to themselves, and asking certain questions which he answers in his first letter. There had come some Jews from Palestine and raised the old issue against Paul that he was not an apostle, that he had never seen the Lord, that he did not even claim the support of an apostle, but worked for a living, but that Peter was the man to follow. After Paul left Corinth, Apollos, a great Alexandrian rhetorician, a greater orator than Paul, came there, and they were much taken with him. They began to say, "I am for Peter, or for Apollos, or for Christ, or for Paul." They began to misuse those gifts in a way to bring confusion. Their meetings were disorderly; their women became unseemly. When they celebrated the Lord's supper they made a regular meal of it, and became drunk. A certain man in the Corinthian church had taken his father's wife, and the church stood up for him. Paul's heart was almost broken. He sent Titus with this letter.

Here is a bibliography of Paul for this period:

1. Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul."

2. Farrar's "Life of Paul."

3. Stalker's "Life of Paul," particularly his chapter on the New Testament church.

4. McGregor's "Divine Authority of Paul's Writings."

5. Monod's "Five Lectures on Paul."

6. Wilkinson's "Epic of Paul."

Here follows a complete analysis of the letter:

I. The Historical Introduction, which gives the place, its history, the establishment of the church, succeeding events, the occasion of the letter, when, where and by whom written.

II. Salutation and Thanksgiving, chapter 1:1-9.

III. The third, and perhaps the most important division of the analysis, is the Ecclesiastical Disorders; there are seven of these, as follows:

1. Factions, from chapters 1:10 to 4:7, and this is a matter of very great importance, especially to preachers.

2. Revolt against the apostolic authority, 4:8-21 and 9:1-27.

3. Consequent relaxation of morals and discipline, chapter 5.

4. Going to law against brethren, 6:1-10.

5. Perversion of the Lord's supper, 10:1-22; 11:18-34.

6. Abuse and misuse of spiritual gifts, 12, 13, 14.

7. The perversion of woman's position, conduct and dress, 11:1-7; 14:34-37.

IV. The fourth general division is Social Questions, including the following items:

1. Meat offered to idols.

2. Marriage and divorce.

3. Circumcision and slavery.

V. The fifth general division is False Doctrine concerning the resurrection, 15. The subdivisions of the false doctrine are:

1. Resurrection is a spiritual affair, and is past already.

2. Philosophical objections to bodily resurrection and the reply to these objections. In the reply he shows, (1) that resurrection is a fundamental doctrine; (2) the fact of Christ's resurrection establishes our resurrection. Our resurrection depends on Him.

VI. The sixth division of the analysis: General Directions and explanation about collections, Timothy and Apollos, Stephanas and Achaicus, 16:1-12, 15-18.

VII. The seventh division of the analysis: Exhortation, 16:13, 14.

VIII. Closing salutations, 16:19-21.

IX. The Anathema, 16:22.

X. Benediction, 16:23, 24.

Paul left there and went to Ephesus in a round about way, and while he was at Ephesus holding a great meeting, he received notification from certain persons from the church at Corinth bringing him the most doleful intelligence. The household of Chloe brought him the word; they were urging him to come back. He wouldn't quit the meeting to come back, but he writes: "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost; for a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." He felt that two duties could not conflict, and instead of returning to Corinth he wrote this letter. He had previously written a letter that was not preserved. He now writes this letter through Sosthenes, an amanuensis, and sends Timothy as his delegate over to Corinth. He is intensely anxious to hear before he visits Corinth. That was the occasion of the letter. The letter was written at Ephesus, and written on account of the reports that came to him concerning the demoralization in that great new church that he had established at Corinth.

QUESTIONS

1. What the first and second groups of Paul's letters, and what the theme of each group?
2. How do the letters of the second group compare with other literature?
3. What the location of Corinth on a map of the Roman empire, and what the advantages of its position?
4. Give briefly the ancient Greek history of Corinth.
5. Give briefly its history under Roman domination.
6. What of its moral status during this time, what of their religion, and where may we find a description of the moral degradation of these people?
7. What constituted the population of Corinth at this time, why so many Jews there, and what noted couple among them did Paul find there?
8. What of the architecture and renown of the city?
9. What were some of the celebrities of this city?
10. From what N. T. books do we gather the history of the establishment of the church in this city?
11. Give a summary of the history of the establishment of this church, answering the following questions: (1) Whence came Paul to Corinth, and what was his method of preaching in his last effort before coming to Corinth? (2) How was he conveyed to Corinth? (3) What his physical condition when he arrived at Corinth? (4) With whom did he do his first missionary work here, what his method and what the results? (5) From what class of people were most of Paul's converts at Corinth, and what marvelous displays of divine power among them? (6) What the difficulties, how was Paul nerved to meet them, and what the lesson for us? (7) Give an account of Gallio in his relation to this work in Corinth. (8) How long did Paul stay at Corinth? (9) Where did he go when he left Corinth, and what of the work at Corinth after he left there?
12. Give a bibliography of Paul for this period.
13. What the main points of the analysis?
14. When and where was this letter written, and what the occasion of it?

XIV

THE SALUTATION—ELOQUENCE AND FACTIONAL DIVISIONS

Scripture: I Cor. 1:1-31

IN this discussion we commence with the salutation and thanksgiving as the second item of the analysis The salutation is the first three verses. The thanksgiving extends from verses 4 to 9, inclusive. Let us look at that salutation: "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." If we turn back to the salutation of I Thessalonians, we find that it says: "Paul, and Sylvanus, and Timothy, unto the church of the Thessalonians." But this one says, "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God." The change arises from the objection that had been raised against him in the city of Corinth. Therefore from now on, he never commences a letter without affirming his call to the apostleship and his qualification for it.

One of the occasions for the letter was that a man from Judea, bearing letters of recommendation, had sought to undermine Paul's influence by denouncing his apostleship, and now Paul puts into his letters a statement of his full apostolic claim: "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ through the will of God, and Sosthenes our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, even them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, with all that call upon the name of our Lord Jesus Christ in every place, their Lord and ours."

The salutation, then, is from Paul and Sosthenes, who is the amanuensis. When we come to the end of the letter we will see that Paul grabs the pen and writes that anathema with his own hand. The only letter that he did write with his own hand throughout, was the letter to the Galatians. His eyes were very bad, and he wrote in great sprawling letters, about which he says, "See with how large letters I write unto you with mine own hand." Because of this defect in his eyesight he employed a clerk.

Great fundamental principles are discussed in this letter, and it is addressed to them directly, but it was not intended to be merely a local letter. The expression, "With all that call, etc.," lifts it above local restrictions. We notice in the salutation his use of the words, "sanctified," and "saints," one indicating past time, and the other present time: "Them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints." The two words come from a common root. Sanctification has three Bible significations: Primarily it means to set apart. God sanctified the seventh day and set it apart. Jesus said, "I sanctify myself," that is, "I set myself apart to do the work which I am to do." In one instance at least, the word "sanctification" is used as an equivalent of regeneration, because sanctification commences in regeneration, and the passage is this: "The elect . . . according to the foreknowledge of God the Father, in sanctification of the Spirit." There, sanctification includes both sanctification and regeneration. The third sense is where it is limited to what is called the doctrine of sanctification as distinguished from justification and regeneration. Regeneration is an instantaneous act of the Spirit of God, giving a holy disposition to the mind, renewing the man, applying to him the cleansing blood of Christ. But

sanctification, in its doctrinal aspect, is the progressive work of making completely holy that new life which is commenced in regeneration. And then it goes on until the man's soul is made completely holy—as holy as God is holy. In justification Christ's righteousness is imparted to us through faith; in sanctification, before the work is completed, or when it is completed, we personally are made righteous altogether. Sanctification of the spirit culminates in death. When the soul is separated from the body it is sanctified—made perfect. Paul says, "The spirits of just men made perfect." Death is the last lesson in sanctification. He continues the salutation: "Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." Paul's salutations always consist of first, "grace," and then "peace," because peace depends on grace.

In every letter that he writes, just after the salutation is a thanksgiving statement. He had hard work in finding ground for thanksgiving here, but he always finds it if it is there. He always gives his thanks to God for the good that there is, before he begins to point out evil. I take great blame to myself that I do not follow Paul with regard to thankfulness concerning the brethren. I am afraid many of us are addicted to censoriousness; because of the spirit of criticism we see but little reason for thankfulness in many of our brethren.

An old deacon of the church to which I first preached told me of one man who never condemned, who in every case found some good in whomsoever was mentioned. Finally they made a bet that even the deacon could not find a good thing to say about a certain man that was a notoriously bad character and who had just died. They told the old deacon about it and he stood a while and then said, "Brethren, we ought to be thankful that he

was a good whistler." He just wouldn't say a condemnatory thing about anybody.

This letter of Paul to the church at Corinth was a sharp letter, and particularly when he criticises the abuse and misuse of the miraculous spiritual gifts. I once heard a preacher say, "Don't burn the ship in order to get rid of the rats." So Paul does not discount the great spiritual gifts because by some people they were so abused and misused. These gifts were more widely diffused among the Corinthians than at any other place of which we have any account in the Bible. It was a great necessity at that place for these spiritual gifts in order to get a hearing. Referring to these gifts Paul says, "In everything ye were enriched in Him, in all utterance and all knowledge; even as the testimony of Christ was confirmed in you: so that ye come behind in no gift." That is a new ground of thanksgiving that we have not found before.

With this brief prelude Paul launches at once into the discussion of the great questions that occasioned the letter. First of all were the eight ecclesiastical disorders. This is what he says: "Now I beseech you, brethren, through the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same thing, and that there be no divisions among you; but that you be perfected together in the same mind and in the same judgment. For it hath been signified unto me concerning you, my brethren, by them that are of the household of Chloe, that there are contentions among you." Let us see what kind of contentions, and how factions started in that church, and let us see if, so far as our knowledge of factions goes, that they arise from the same cause. I don't suppose that there ever was a preacher who didn't at some time or other see a divided church. There are men today with a great

burden on their hearts because of divisions in the church where they preach. We want to know how these factions started. He said, "Each one of you saith, I am of Paul; and I am of Apollos; and I am of Cephas; and I am of Christ." What then is the contention about? The members of the church are partial toward spiritual leaders. After Paul left there, Apollos, of Alexandria, an eloquent rhetorican, came there, and he was a mighty orator, and the people were led away by his eloquence, and later there came these brethren from Judea who thought that Peter was a great man. Apollos himself was not to blame; he had nothing to do with it. But a faction rallied around Apollos, another around Peter, another rallied around Christ. Some held to Peter and some held to themselves, and said, "I am a 'Christ-i-an,'" others, "I am Apollosite, I am a Peterite, or I am a Christite." While Paul was away Apollos came there and preached, and being a very eloquent man and a rhetorician, with all of the arts of polished speech, with well-rounded periods, his speech so very fine that admiration for the rhetoric of it led some to disregard the matter of it, so that to them the speech was lost in its oratory.

At various conventions I have heard men remarking on certain speakers. One said concerning a certain address, "That was the most logical, best rounded, and of the most homiletic art," showing that they were studying the manner and casting of the speech more than the preaching itself, just like discussing a woman's dress instead of the woman.

The gravest factions that ever agitated the churches of Jesus Christ have come up around persons more than doctrines, politics or measures. In ninety-nine cases out of one hundred, rows in the church come up around preachers. Laymen as a rule don't like a fuss in a

church, but the preacher oftentimes makes a great deal of harm, intending really to do good instead of evil, and yet because he doesn't know how to do certain things, and particularly how to handle delicate cases of discipline, there will be a scene, and directly the cause of a splitting of the church wide open. Generally we can get men to compromise, and by reasoning and prayer, we may bring them into doctrinal agreement, but the hardest men to harmonize in the world are those who are contentious about men. That is why we should never seek after a "stock-pole" unification, *i. e.,* stack around a man. He may die, and then what becomes of our unit?

It was a grief to Paul because people had made his name a cause of faction. Let us carefully and prayerfully make the application to our own hearts, and note the great arguments Paul gives against these factions. He says, "Is Christ divided?" *i. e.,* is our Lord Jesus Christ to be cut up and parceled and measured out, one piece to one man, another to another man? So long as Christ is the center of our unification, kingship, priesthood, there should be no division about men.

When I was a schoolboy I was an enthusiastic supporter of the Union, though when my state seceded, I entered the Southern army and remained in it four years. In my last days at school I stood on a goods box in the streets of Independence under the last Star-Spangled Banner ever lifted to the sun of Texas before the war, and with a great mob gathered round to pull down the flag, I commenced my oration by repeating the poem:

"Think ye that I could brook to see
That banner I have loved so long,
Borne piecemeal o'er the distant sea,
Divided, measured, parceled out,
Tamely surrendered up forever,
To satisfy the soulless rabble? Never, never!"

I have to confess that I changed my conviction about the right policy of secession, after I saw that they had to secede. There was not anything else to be done, but I am just showing how here in measuring, parceling out, the thought is just the same.

Notice Paul's next argument: "Was Paul crucified for you? You say you are for Paul, Cephas, or for Apollos: is any one of these your Savior? Was Peter judged before Pilate? Was it Peter that entered the three hours of darkness and cried out, 'My God, why hast thou forsaken me?' Was it by the shed blood of Paul that your sins were forgiven? If none of these men was crucified for you, then in the name of consistency, why name them as rallying points? When you came up and testified for Christ's sake that God had forgiven your sins, and when you were led into the water, and the preacher lifted up his hand over your head, did he say, 'Upon your public profession, I baptize you in the name of Peter?'" He makes his argument still stronger, saying, "I thank God that I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius—and the household of Stephanas."

Never shall I forget one of my earliest controversies. A man came to my town and was affirming that baptism was essential to salvation, like repentance and faith. I stood up before him and said,

"Will you tell me then, why Paul said, 'I thank God I baptized none of you save Crispus and Gaius?' You say baptism is essential to salvation; Paul said, 'God sent me not to baptize but to preach the gospel.'" Notice how he puts baptism in opposition to the gospel.

Then further, if there were no other words in the Bible than the words we have here, they are forever fatal to the doctrine of baptismal salvation.

Those who were converted were usually baptized by other ministers. Perhaps he baptized these when he first reached Corinth and was by himself. But soon after Timothy, Titus and Silas joined him and performed the rest of the baptizing.

Christ never baptized at all, but Christ saved men, therefore His baptism was not essential to salvation.

It was Peter who opened the door to the Gentiles, and they through faith received remission of sins. He commanded them to be baptized; he did not do it himself. Baptism is a commandment of great importance, but it is not a condition of salvation. Paul says, "I thank God I baptized none of you lest somebody, in saying, 'I am of Paul,' should give as a reason 'I am better than you are because Paul baptized me.'" I can understand that one who is to be baptized would prefer that a dear friend should perform that ordinance, just as people marry and want some dear friend to perform that rite; but it is not necessary that a particular person should do it. If it is a fact that a certain person should not do the baptizing, then that should be made no ground for division, or from the fact that there are three denominations at least who recognize us as proper subjects of baptism, but who refuse to recognize it because we were not baptized by the bishop or some person high in church position.

Notice the continuation of Paul's argument: "For the word of the cross is to them that perish foolishness; but unto us who are saved it is the power of God. For it is written, I will destroy the wisdom of the wise. And the discernment of the discerning will I bring to nought. Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world? hath not God made foolish the wisdom of the world? For seeing that in the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God, it was

God's good pleasure through the foolishness of the preaching to save them that believe."

The application is this: One of the factions of that Corinthian church arose out of the great dialectic skill of Apollos in his preaching and in his argument. That, says Paul, can be no ground for a faction in the church of Jesus Christ, because true preaching holds up the cross only as a means of salvation, and not the oratorical manner in which one talks about the cross. He goes on to show why it was in his preaching that he refused that oratorical method. He says, "I came, not relying upon the wisdom of the world and argumentation. I came in weakness, fear and trembling, praying that your faith should not stand in man, but in the demonstration of the Spirit, and I held up nothing before you but the cross of our Lord Jesus Christ." If a church is to be divided on a question of rhetoric or philosophic training, then I propound Paul's questions, "Where is the wise? where is the scribe? where is the disputer of this world?" God had poured His contempt upon the whole of it. The world by wisdom knew not God. All the wise men of the world were never able to find Him nor to devise a single plank of the bridge of salvation that spans the chasm between hell and heaven.

He continues to argue: "Not only is this true, but I appeal to your experience, For behold your calling, brethren, that not many wise after the flesh, not many mighty, not many noble, are called: but God chose the foolish things of the world, that He might put to shame them that are wise; and God chose the weak things of the world, that He might put to shame the things that were strong; and the base things of the world, and the things that are despised, did God choose, yea, and the things that are not, that He might bring to nought the things

that are; that no flesh should glory before God." If salvation is dependent upon the eloquence of preachers, the logic of Aristotle and wisdom of Socrates; if the number of converts are to be measured by the preacher's acquaintance with flights of fancy, and with great epic poems that he has either written or read, then, indeed, might one make that a ground of contention, but the very highest estimate that one can put upon any of that is that it is merely a scaffolding.

I have oftentimes seen a great sermon fail to convict because it was too ornate, too delicate, too polished. It did not deal directly with the naked souls of men.

That was a shrewd thing in Paul to appeal to their experience: "Look at yourselves! You were a rag-a-muffin crowd—thieves, murderers, adulterers. Did rhetoric come to you in the mud, and wash you clean? Was it the power of the orator that could charm you from the degradation of sin, and could lift you up and put your feet upon the rock? O brethren, it was the gospel of the Lord Jesus Christ! The cross of Christ is the only true thing in preaching that saves men, and here you are spliting up the church because one preacher is more eloquent than another."

I feel pressed in spirit to enforce upon the minds of preachers the subject of contention. Let them beware that there should come death unto the church of Jesus Christ on their account. Though a Christian cannot be lost, the church can be destroyed. Because that church organization is the temple of the Holy Spirit, God says, and Paul brings out the statement of God in this letter, "Him that destroyeth the temple of God will God destroy, and His temple are ye." That does not mean that the preacher loses his soul, but that on account of his church he may be stricken and temporarily destroyed so

that he will never get over it; his usefulness gone and his name on record as the man who divided the church, and the light was put out, and all because "him that destroyeth the temple of God will God destroy."

What graver lesson does Texas need than she has had? Some years ago all our work was paralyzed on account of hypercriticism, until at last the brethren saw that there could never be a forward move, the people of God could never advance with banner unfurled, and from the very day that they drew the line of demarkation until now, there has been one colossal stride after another toward greater things. Let us go back in our mind over the list of ministers who have lost their hold on congregations, not as Christians, but as preachers, and have made shipwreck of their lives. There was a man that destroyed a certain church of Jesus; he came in as a ground of faction; he worked up a party of division around himself, and the power of the church was lost. When he did that he signed his death warrant as a useful preacher.

QUESTIONS

1. What constitutes the second item of the analysis, and what the scripture for each division?
2. What particularly distinguishes the salutation of this letter from the preceding salutations in I and II Thessalonians, and why?
3. What expression lifts the letter above local restrictions, and why should this letter not be so restricted?
4. On the phrase, "sanctified, called to be saints," what the several N. T. meanings of the word, "sanctify," how could the sanctification of the Corinthians be past, present and future, what the particular meaning of the word expressing what Baptists call the doctrine of sanctification, and how distinguish it from regeneration and justification?
5. What the relation of "grace" and "peace," and how is this relation indicated?
6. What was Paul's habit in writing his letters, and what the lesson on censoriousness? Illustrate.
7. What the new ground of his thanksgiving here?
8. Were the gifts mentioned in this thanksgiving the ordinary

graces of the Spirit or those miraculous endowments of the Spirit constituting the "baptism in the Holy Spirit?"

9. What passages in the letter show the extent and variety of the miraculous endowments bestowed upon the Corinthians?

10. In view of their misuse and abuse of these gifts, what the explanation of Paul's thankfulness for their reception of them? Illustrate.

11. What the first ecclesiastical disorder, and what part of the letter discusses it?

12. What the occasion of this disorder—persons, doctrines, or discipline, etc.?

13. If persons, were they laymen or preachers, and who were they?

14. What proportion of church divisions now are caused or occasioned by preachers, and when thus occasioned are the preachers always to blame?

15. What is Paul's first argument against factions, and what the present-day application?

16. What his second argument and its application?

17. What his third argument, how does he re-enforce this argument, and what is its bearing on baptismal salvation?

18. What the fourth argument, and what the application to the Corinthians?

19. What the fifth argument, and what the special application to the Corinthians?

20. What the sixth argument, appealing to their personal experience, and what illustration from modern Baptist history?

21. What the meaning of "if any man destroyeth the temple of God, him shall God destroy?"

XV

THE PREACHER AND FACTIONS

Scripture: I Cor. 2:1—4:7

WE shall proceed to repeat part of the ground of the last chapter. We were discussing the third division of the outline, ecclesiastical disorders. The first is factions. There were divisions. Paul, in replying to the evil of divisions in churches about persons, made an argument that the world has never equaled, and which will be important for all time upon the subject of factions.

His first argument against factions is that Christ is not divided. Second, the preacher was not crucified for them. They were making divisions about preachers, yet nobody was crucified but Christ. Third, nobody was baptized in the name of a preacher. Fourth, one of the grounds of division was that some preachers were more oratorical than others in their speaking, and used eloquence and philosophies of the schools. In replying to that he stated the wise or oratorical preacher does not save men. They are saved by the cross. Therefore, it is perfectly foolish to have a division about persons on the ground that one is more oratorical than another. Fifth, that worldly wisdom never did discover God, and never could have devised a plan of salvation. God gave the wisdom of the world all the opportunity that it wanted from the beginning of time to the coming of Christ. There had been

many wise men, particularly among the Greeks and Romans, but what did their wisdom amount to? It had never discovered the nature of God, devised a system of morals or a plan of salvation. History presents the awful anomaly that the wisest cities in the world, such as Athens, Ephesus and Corinth, were morally rotten, spiritually putrid. Their wisdom did not save them from obscenity or debauchery. The sixth argument is that as a matter of fact few of the wise and the great men were saved. Somehow their wisdom and their greatness prevented their stooping down and becoming little children in receiving the gospel of Jesus Christ. He proves this by appealing to their own case. "You know, brethren, from your own experience that not many wise, great or noble are called." The seventh argument against division where it was predicated on superior worldly wisdom on the part of any of the persons about whom the division was centered, is that Christ himself is the wisdom of the Christian, the righteousness, sanctification and redemption of the Christian. How beautifully he works in the thought of the Trinity, "Who was made unto us wisdom from God, and righteousness and sanctification and redemption." While Christ is the wisdom, righteousness, sanctification and redemption of His people, the application is different. He is not our sanctification in the sense that He is our righteousness. Our righteousness is imputed to us, and we receive it by a single act of faith. Our sanctification is applied to us differently by the Holy Spirit, and becomes at last a personal righteousness.

His eighth argument is that the gospel which saves men is not discerned according to carnal wisdom, but is spiritually discerned. Whether a man be wise or ignorant does not enter into the question. We might take a Negro that could not read a letter in a book, and put seven wise

men of Greece against him, and the Negro might spiritually discern the gospel of eternal life preached to him as a poor, ignorant, lost soul quicker than the seven wise men of Greece.

I have often used as an illustration of that, the case of Gen. Speight, whose children live in Waco now. He was a great man in many respects. He was the best organizer and trainer of a regiment I ever knew, and his intellect was as quick as lightning, and yet he could not see how to be converted until his old Negro servant took him off in the gin-house and showed him how to come to Christ.

That applies in Paul's argument. One of the grounds of division was that they were instituting comparisons between Paul and Apollos. Apollos was a wise man, expert in Alexandrian philosophy. Paul wants to know what that counts in a case of this kind. The natural man receives not the things of God. They are foolishness to him.

His ninth argument is that factions hinder spiritual progress. They were yet babes in Christ when they ought to have been teachers. I don't know anything that can more quickly destroy the spiritual progress of the church than divisions. Let a church be divided into two parties, one following Deacon A and the other Deacon B; one clamoring for this preacher and the other for that; let the line be drawn sharply, then all spirituality dies. There cannot be power in the church while that continues.

The tenth argument consists of some questions: "What then is Apollos? and what is Paul?" At a last analysis they are only the instruments or ministers by whom they believed; God himself gave the increase.

He advances in the eleventh argument: "You are divided about preachers. You are not the preacher's field or his building. You are God's field; you are God's

building. Then if you are God's building you don't belong to this preacher or to that preacher."

The twelfth argument is that the only foundation in this building is Jesus Christ: "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." The thirteenth argument is that all the incongruous material the preacher puts on that foundation will be destroyed in the great judgment day—tried by fire. He refers to the material received for church membership. Paul laid a divine foundation for the church at Corinth. Other men proposed to build on that foundation. Suppose a man puts into the temple of God "wood, hay, stubble." Some people thatch the roof of the house with hay or stubble. Every addition to that church, when the Master comes to examine His building, that has not been made of living stone, lasting spiritual material, will be cut out and will go up in fire and smoke. So we will say that one reason for the division was that a preacher held a meeting and received a thousand members and 975 came in without conviction or repentance—a dry-eyed, easy, little faith, little sinner, little savior—and it did not amount to anything. The preacher, if a Christian, will be saved, but every bit of the unworthy material he put in the church will be lost, and because the work is lost he will suffer loss of reward for his labors.

His fourteenth argument is that factions destroy the church, which is the temple of God, which temple they were: "Him that destroyeth the temple of God will God destroy." I never knew it to fail where a man through his fault destroyed a church of Christ that that man was destroyed world without end. Even if he was a Christian he was destroyed. Not as to eternal life, but certainly as to his usefulness in this world. His fifteenth argument is—what a text! I heard Dr. Hatcher, of Rich-

mond, preach a sermon on it. The church does not belong to the preachers; the preachers belong to the church: "All things are yours; whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas, or the world, or life, or death, or things present, or things to come, all are yours; and ye are Christ's; and Christ is God's."

The sixteenth argument is that these preachers about which they were dividing this church must be counted simply as stewards of the grace of God, the deposit of the gospel which has been given to them. They were not to be looked on as the builders, the authors and the savior of the church. What they were to do in their case was to ask the one question, "Has this steward been faithful?" The seventeenth argument is that they were dividing this church on their human judgment of men, and their human judgment didn't count at all. The King James version of 4:3 is, "But with me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; yea, I judge not mine own self. For I know nothing by myself." How many sermons I have heard on that when the thought is not that at all! This is the meaning of the true text of the Greek: "For though I know nothing against myself, yet I am not hereby justified, *i.e.,* human judgment doesn't count. In other words, I may seem to myself perfect, but I may have a thousand faults. The judge is God, and when God lets the light shine, He brings out some spot I don't see in the dim light of my wisdom. You remember David's prayer, "Cleanse thou me from secret faults, *i.e.,* not faults that I am keeping hid from my wife and my friends, but faults secret to me." "The heart is deceitful above all things and desperately wicked; who can know it?"

The eighteenth and last argument is this: Preachers deserve no credit for difference in gifts, and yet they

were making their different gifts the ground of their division: "For who maketh thee to differ? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive?" One of the greatest blessings in this world today is the difference of gifts that God gives to the church and His preachers. Two of the most important chapters in the Bible are devoted to a discussion of that question, Romans 12 and I Cor. 12. God has never yet called a man to preach who cannot do some things better than anybody else in the world. He never gives two men exactly the same gifts. I am conscious that I can do some things better than other people. I am sure that God has given me the gift of interpretation of His Word. But others can do some things better than I can. I would hate it very much if I were the best sample in the kingdom all along the line. It would be a very sad thing for the world if some of God's preachers could not beat me in some things. They had made this difference in gifts the ground of their factions. Now, call each man up and say, "Paul, where did you get your gifts?" He answers, "God gave them to me." "Did you earn them?" "No, they are free grace." "Apollos, where did you get your gifts?" "God gave them to me." "You did not purchase them from God?" "No, they came through free grace."

One of the greatest preachers I ever heard stood up in the pulpit and pointed to a homely old Baptist preacher in the crowd and said, "Brethren, I would give all I am worth in the world to be able to preach like that man." The most of the crowd would have said, "You beat him." He could beat him, but not in all things. That man could preach a sermon by the way he got up in the pulpit and opened the Bible. The humility and tenderness of soul with which he looked into the faces of the sinners was marvelous. That fact alone ought to keep down the

jealousy of one preacher against another preacher. There is such a thing as improving one's gifts, and for that a man does deserve credit. A man may have a gift, and by disuse of that gift it will go into bankruptcy; one may be lazy and won't study, and for that he is to be blamed. I care not how dull a man is naturally, if God has called that man, He had a reason for calling him. He has some work for him to do that Michael and Gabriel could not do. That man is responsible for just what gifts he has, and he ought to try to improve those gifts, and not try to imitate somebody whose gifts are different from his.

I am glad our Lord did not, in this matter, imitate a candle-maker who brings a great tub full of tallow and pours it into one mould. All candles come out of candle-moulds exactly alike. I am glad the Lord's preacher-material is not like a tub of tallow, and that it is not all run into one mould. We want diversity of gifts and division of labor. Some have the gift of exhortation; others, exposition, pastoral power, tactfulness in visiting the sick and the strangers. Some have the evangelistic gift, and some one thing and some another. Thus we have the eighteen arguments which Paul gives against the first of these ecclesiastical disorders—factions.

The second ecclesiastical disorder was a revolt against apostolic authority, beginning with 4:8 and continuing to the end of that chapter, and taking all of chapter 9. In order to unify this discussion, I have taken everything in the letter that bears upon the revolt against apostolic authority. But who questioned Paul's apostolic authority? Visiting Jewish professors of religion, coming from Jerusalem and having that Judaizing spirit, which would make the Christian religion nothing but a sect of Judaism, came up to Corinth. In the second letter we

have this same topic for discussion. These visiting brethren brought letters of recommendation from people in Judea, as we learn in the second letter, and they questioned Paul's apostolic authority. On what grounds did they question his apostolic authority?

1. Because he was not one of the original twelve apostles, and had not seen the Lord in His lifetime.

2. He did not exercise the apostolic powers when his authority was questioned. Ananias and Sapphira tried to fool Peter and they were struck dead by exertion of apostolic power. But Paul did not use the power of an apostle to strike men dead in Corinth that differed with him.

3. He had not claimed apostolic support for himself, therefore it was evident that he did not count himself as deserving it. The twelve apostles, particularly Cephas and the brothers of our Lord, being married men, as apostles, for devoting themselves to the apostolic office, demanded support for themselves and their families.

4. His suffering proclaimed that he was not an apostle. If he were God's apostle, he would not get into so much trouble, for the Lord would take care of him.

5. His was not the true gospel. The true gospel was given to those who accompanied the Lord Jesus Christ, beginning with the baptism of John down to the time He was taken to heaven. Paul was not even a Christian when that took place.

6. His folly. He did a great many foolish things in the way of expediency.

7. His bodily infirmities and weaknesses. He was a little sore-eyed Jew, bald-headed, with no grace of oratory and no rhetorical form of speech.

8. He was against Moses and the Mosaic law.

9. He was a preacher to the Gentiles.

These are the nine distinct grounds upon which these living, visiting brethren, who had done nothing for that church, came over there to work up a case. Whenever I read about it I always feel indignant against that scaly crowd. This is a part of Paul's great controversy to which Stalker devotes a chapter in his "Life of Paul." The letters which are alive with the items of this controversy are I and II Corinthians, Galatians and Romans. Later it comes up in another form in Philippians, Colossians and Ephesians, and the same matter in yet a different form later in Hebrews. We will see how Paul replies to this question of his apostleship in the next chapter.

QUESTIONS

1. Re-state the first six arguments against factions.
2. What the seventh argument against division predicated on superior worldly wisdom, and how does Paul here bring in the thought of the Trinity?
3. How is Christ our righteousness, sanctification and redemption?
4. What the eighth argument, relating to the Gospel, and what illustrations given?
5. What the ninth argument, relating to spiritual progress?
6. What the tenth argument, relating to the instruments of their faith?
7. What the eleventh argument, relating to God's field, or building?
8. What the twelfth argument, relating to the foundation?
9. What the thirteenth argument, relating to incongruous material?
10. What the fourteenth argument, relating to the temple of God?
11. What the fifteenth argument, relating to church-ownership, and what sermon noted on this as a text?
12. What the sixteenth argument, referring to the deposit of the Gospel?
13. What the seventeenth argument, referring to human judgment, and how is this text often misapplied?
14. What the eighteenth argument, referring to gifts, and what special blessing in the diversity of gifts?
15. What the second ecclesiastical disorder at Corinth, and who caused it?
16. On what grounds did they question Paul's apostolic authority?
17. In what letters of Paul do we have this great controversy?

XVI

THE REVOLT AGAINST PAUL'S APOSTOLIC AUTHORITY

Scripture: I Cor. 4:8-21; 9:1-27

IN the last chapter this question was asked, "Who questioned Paul's authority?" And our answer was, "Visiting brethren from Jerusalem," and we discussed the various grounds upon which they based their questionings. Paul's reply is found in 4:8-21, all of chapter 9 and three or four verses in chapter 15. We take two sections somewhat distant apart and put them together in order to put everything together that bears upon the discussion.

The first charge was that he was not one of the original twelve. He admits the allegation, but denies the deduction. Jesus Christ had as much right to appoint an apostle after His resurrection as He had while in the flesh. It will be remembered that Acts 1, through the Spirit, Matthias, not one of the original twelve, was numbered with the twelve, received the baptism of the Holy Spirit, and became in every way a qualified apostle of Jesus Christ. Paul was as truly appointed an apostle by the will of God as Peter was. There never was any more definite or important a transaction than his meeting the Lord on the way to Damascus at which time he was not only converted, but was specially called into the apostolic office. Over and over again in his letters and in his

life are evidences that the Lord not only originally called him, but appeared to him many times in confirmation of that call. So he well says in commencing this letter, "Paul, called to be an apostle of Jesus Christ, through the will of God."

Then they charged that he had not seen Jesus in the flesh. He admits the fact, but he says it is altogether unimportant whether he had seen Jesus in the flesh or not. He had seen Him after He rose from the dead, and that was the point upon which the apostleship rested. That he had seen the risen Lord constituted his qualification to be a witness as an apostle.

They charged that he had not exercised his apostolic authority in vindicating himself by punitive judgments on those that questioned him. Peter had Ananias and Sapphira struck dead for telling a lie. It is said that Paul talked big enough, but did not act. To that Paul replies that on account of mercy he had refrained from vindicating, by punitive right, his power, but that he had a right and could exercise it, and when he got among them he would do it unless they repented of the wrongs that they had done.

They charged that he had not exacted apostolic support for himself and wife. They argued that he, in his own conscience, did not feel entitled to it. His reply to that is superb, and is completely unanswerable. He commences with chapter 9, which is *the* chapter of the Bible on the scriptural grounds for ministerial support, by saying, "Am I not free?" This matter of support is a right, not a duty. "May I not waive the right if I choose?" There are some things we can waive if we choose to do so.

A certain man whom I knew, an exceedingly eccentric man, was, as a widower, paying his addresses to a widow.

The lady said when he asked her to marry him, "I have some objections to marrying you." He said, "I have a great many objections to marrying you, but I waive them."

Next, Paul gives the reasons why he waived the right. They were missionary reasons. If he had come there and made his first speech on their paying him a salary, nobody would have listened to him. It was not after the plan of God's gospel that a missionary, reaching territory that had never been occupied, should lay great stress on the people's paying him to preach to them. The next is, that his desires were for them, not for their money: "I coveted *you* for Christ, and not anything that you had." Third, as a matter of fact it was not true, since in part he had been supported while among them, through a contribution of the church.

Next, that he labored with his own hands, not because an apostle had to do that, but because it was a necessity for an important lesson to them in that community. Tens of thousands of Corinthians were loafers. Paul wanted to be able to say, "You remember—you people who won't work—that when I was among you I worked by night and preached to you by day. These hands ministered unto my support in order that you might understand that he who won't work should not eat." There is no sentimentality about Paul on the beggar question. They charged that he had exacted no pay for his preaching. He replied that that did not make him inferior, but made them inferior: "For what is there wherein ye were made inferior to the rest of the churches, except it be that ye were brought to Christ and established and built up by my ministry, and ye did not pay me a cent?" Then he said, "Forgive me this wrong. It was wrong for me to waive my right to a support that you should not be

instructed to minister to those who minister to you." Then he goes on to prove his right.

To the end of time, I Cor. 9, will be the chapter in the New Testament on the subject of ministerial support. I once took as a text this scripture: "My defense to them that examine me is this." They put him upon examination. He bases his answer, first, upon analogy from human conduct in other things, and cites three things: First, the soldier: "Who goeth forth to warfare at his own charges?" They objected to a preacher being supported for his ministry. On all sides these people could see soldiers. "Do they pay for their rations, their uniforms, their weapons, their hospital in which they stay, and the medicine which they take?" It would be impossible to have an army permanently without setting aside from some source adequate support for them. So applying that analogy to the preacher, why may he not have a right to a support? Paul might have gone further: Officers in the army are not merely provided for the field, but are educated at national expense, like cadets at West Point, or naval cadets at Annapolis.

My wife's brother, Willie Harrison, is in the navy. I remember well when he was just a boy he entered Annapolis as a cadet. He knew no more about a ship than he did about a balloon. He is now lieutenant on one of the great battleships, and has charge of a most responsible position in its navigation. I went to see him a few years ago and went all over the yards at Annapolis, Washington, and Baltimore. It became perfectly evident to me that no untrained man could be a naval officer. His training must commence very early. As I looked at every process of making defensive armor that protected those enormous guns, I realized that one slight mistake and the whole ship would blow up, and that the keenest,

highest education was necessary in order to know how to handle those ships in time of war.

Then he cites the case of the vine-dresser: "Who planteth a vineyard and eateth not the fruit thereof?" One cannot drag a man to a piece of ground, make him clear it, cultivate and gather the grapes, and not pay him anything. He asks: "Who feedeth the flock and eateth not of the milk of the flock." Will a Texas cowboy take charge of a herd of cattle, watch by day and night, nearly kill himself avoiding a stampede, be burned in the sun, and do all for nothing? Hasn't he a right to a piece of beef, to milk and butter? Or if it be sheep, to a piece of mutton, or to woolen clothes? That argument is perfectly unanswerable.

Second, he appeals to the law of Moses. The Jews were questioning his right. He refers to their law, "Say I these things as a man? It is written in the law of Moses. Does the Mosaic law forbid a man to muzzle his ox that is threshing the grain?" In those days they threshed the grain by oxen treading on it continuously. That was their primitive way of threshing. "Now would you begrudge an ox his food if he stooped to get a bite of grain? The Mosaic law forbids you to muzzle the ox that treads out the grain. If it be a sin to muzzle an ox, is it not a greater sin to muzzle a man that brings the message of eternal life to the people? He brings not the bread of earth, but the bread of heaven. Certainly it applies more to men than to oxen." He says, "If we have sown unto you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things? The preacher finds you in darkness under the power of Satan, lost; and in tears and love he pleads with you and you are led to Christ and find eternal life. The spiritual things to which he leads you are worth more than all the world. Is it

then unreasonable that he should reap your carnal things?" In other words, a man who by the grace of God and through the ministry of a faithful preacher has been led to eternal life and made a partaker of the inheritance of the saints, who would grudge help in a carnal way to the one who had been the means of his salvation, would certainly throw a question over his salvation.

Notice his next argument, viz.: their own conduct: "If there be those who are partakers of this power over you, are not we rather?" In other words, "The preachers you have had you have paid for their services. You concede the right to Peter and others, and if this support is for them, why not Paul? Ask yourselves which one of these led you to salvation. Paul is the one that found you and led you out of darkness into light." Then he passes to his next argument, still on the law of Moses, the Levites and the priests: "Do you know that they who minister about the holy things of life, of the things in the temple, and they which wait at the altar are partakers of the altar? The tribe of Levi, which had no territory given to them, had become the Lord's servants to do the Lord's work and minister to the Lord's sanctuary, and the Lord provides for their support."

He thus makes the application of these five distinct arguments: "Even so did the Lord ordain that they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel." It certainly is an important declaration. As a government maintains its soldiers, and when they get old and feeble, it provides hospitals and infirmaries, and when officers are retired they receive half pay, so "God hath ordained that they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

When Christ sent out His apostles He commanded

them to take no means of support, saying, "The laborer is worthy of his meat and his hire." In other words, "I would be a very poor employer if I sent you out to confine your attention strictly to my work, and make you hustle to get your living from other things." Wherever there is no adequate provision for ministerial support, and the preacher must do things for his living, run a farm or practice medicine, we may rest assured that he cannot give his undivided attention to the ministry, and that churches that receive that kind of ministry do not receive the full work of the ministry. The calamity in that case is on the church. Oftentimes it is downright covetousness that is the cause of it. Churches think we can get Brother So-and-so for $50 a year, and we can just have preaching once a month. Can a church prosper on once a month's preaching?

I have always taken this position: If any preacher, truly called of God to preach, will implicitly trust, not the churches, but the Lord Jesus Christ to take care of him, and will consecrate his entire time to the work of the ministry, verily he shall be clothed and fed, or else the heavens will fall, and God's Word will not be so.

I made that statement once and some of the brethren questioned it. I still stand on it.

If I were a young man again, I would do just as I did then, burn all the bridges behind and push out on the promises of God, that perhaps not in my way, not in the church's way, but in some way the Lord Jesus Christ would take care of my wife and children.

I would say in my heart, "I am God's man; I am to go out as His minister, to do His work, to do no other business; and sink or swim, live or die, survive or perish, I will trust the Lord and stick to my work." I have tried trusting Jesus and He has never failed; I have had men

to lie to me straight-out; I have had 1,000 promises to fail, coming from men, but never has any promise of God failed that He has ever made.

An illustration on this point occurred at an early day in Waco. We had a very skeptical man there, Mr. Berry, whom Dr. Burleson invited to attend an association. He had no buggy, and so Dr. Burleson said, "You may ride with me." When he saw Dr. Burleson's shabby old buggy and rattletrap harness and lean, raw-boned horse, he said, "Dr. Burleson, you have faith that you will get there in that buggy, but I have not; I am going to get a buggy from the livery stable." But Dr. Burleson beat him there just the same. I have known preachers to get there in ramshackle buggies and pieced-out harness, tied with shoe-strings. Once I saw a collar on a horse tied with a necktie, and the preacher had to preach without one, but "he got there just the same."

When Jesus gave the commission He said, "These things shall follow: If a serpent bite you, or you drink deadly poison, it will not hurt you." They applied that to Paul and said, "We infer from your extraordinary afflictions—the Roman lictors, the stripes and scourges of the Jews, and the thorn in your flesh, and that bad eyesight, that if you were an apostle of the Lord He would take care of you." His reply to that is certainly great. It is in chapter 4: "I think God hath set us, the apostles, last of all, as men doomed to death; for we are made a spectacle unto the world *(kosmos)*, both to angels and men. . . . Even unto this present hour we both hunger and thirst and are naked." In other words, "You bring up that charge against me and I accept the facts, but it is worse than you know. You are rich from our labors; you are kings through our labors. We are weak and poor and suffering." Just as Jesus, the

Captain of our salvation, was made perfect through suffering, these apostolic leaders were to share His suffering and fill up what remained, and to bear all things.

A demonstration was needed upon this subject, and therefore he says, "I glory in it." The word, "spectacle," was taken from the custom of the amphitheater where from 50,000 to 200,000 people were gathered—as many as could be gathered in the great Roman amphitheater—and down below a gladiator was to fight a Numidian lion or a Bengal tiger. High upon the platform was the emperor and his suite, and all around in this semi-circle thousands of the people were gathered, and that man was the spectacle. He fights the wild beast, and as his blood gushes out of his wounds he salutes the emperor and says, "Cæsar, I salute thee," and so Paul, about to make his exodus, ready to have his blood poured out as a libation, salutes the Emperor and says, "I have fought the good fight—I have kept the faith; henceforth there is laid up for me the crown of righteousness."

Again he says, not to some Roman, Corinthian, or Athenian amphitheater, but to the *kosmos*—to the universe of angels and men, that all the galleries of heaven are filled with the on-looking angels, and all the population of the earth have their eyes fixed upon these apostles, and they are in the arena appointed unto death. This is proof of their apostleship, as Jesus told him when He called him.

If a man is going to turn his back on the ministry on account of the suffering, the sooner the ministry is rid of him the better. If he is only going to be a sunshine, fair-weather, daylight man, who, because the darkness comes, the march is long, or the battle is terrible, or the cold severe, or the watching is trying, or the wounds are

painful—if he is going to turn away from the ministry of Jesus Christ on that account—let him go.

His reply to their charges that he could not be an apostle because he was not exempt from suffering is one of the finest arguments in literature. Jesus Christ could not be a savior according to that argument, for it was by His suffering he became a savior.

Note: The other charges given in chapter III are answered in chapter XXXI of this volume.

QUESTIONS

1. What the second ecclesiastical disorder, who raised the question, and what the scriptures containing his masterful reply?
2. What Paul's reply to the charge that he was not one of the original twelve, and had not seen Jesus in the flesh?
3. What his reply to the charge that he had not exercised his apostolic authority in punitive judgments?
4. What his reply to the charge that he did not exact support for himself and wife?
5. What the condition at Corinth that made it necessary for him to waive this right?
6. What reflection on them does Paul show in his second letter that they had allowed him to waive his right in the matter of support?
7. What good text on ministerial support cited?
8. What three instances of human conduct does he cite in defense of ministerial support?
9. What his argument from the law of Moses relating to the ox?
10. What his argument from the benefit they received?
11. What his argument from their own conduct?
12. What his argument based on the support of the priests and Levites?
13. What the general application of the five preceding distinctive arguments?
14. What the teaching of Christ on this same line?
15. What the result generally of a poorly paid ministry?
16. What the author's position with regard to the preacher and his support?
17. What Paul's reply to the charge that he had extraordinary afflictions?
18. What the origin and application of the word, "spectacle," as used here?
19. What Paul's reply to the charge that his was not the true gospel?

20. What Paul's reply to the charge that he did a great many foolish things?

21. What Paul's reply to the charge that he had bodily infirmities and weaknesses?

22. What his reply to the charge that he was against the law of Moses?

23. What his reply to the charge that he was a preacher to the Gentiles?

Note: For answer to questions 19-23, study carefully the scriptures cited, and for continuation of the discussion of this subject see last chapter in the book.

XVII

THE RELAXATION OF MORALS

Scripture: I Cor. 5:1—6:20

IN the last chapter we considered the revolt against apostolic authority, and now we are to take up another disorder that is a consequence of that one—the relaxation of morals. It is a settled principle that one sin begets another. In hunting I have sometimes thought that I saw just one quail, but when I flushed him there were two, and sometimes a covey. Longfellow in Hiawatha uses this language:

> "Never stoops the soaring vulture
> On his quarry in the desert,
> On the sick or wounded bison,
> But another vulture, watching
> From his high aerial lookout,
> Sees the downward plunge and follows;
> And a third pursues a second,
> Coming from invisible ether,
> First a speck and then a vulture,
> Till the air is dark with pinions."

That illustrates how sins are gregarious—going in troops. I do not believe it is possible for any man or any church to commit a *single* sin. There are sure to be more than one, if we ever commence at all. It seemed a little thing that they should sin in the way of factions, or that they should sin in the way of revolt against apostolic authority, but these two sins begat this third sin that we are discussing—the relaxation of morals.

The case in point is thus referred to in chapter 5: "It is actually reported that there is fornication among you, and such fornication as is not even among the Gentiles, that one of you hath his father's wife. And ye are puffed up, and did not rather mourn, that he that had done this deed might be taken away from among you. For I verily, being absent in the body but present in spirit, have already as though I were present judged him that hath so wrought this thing, in the name of our Lord Jesus, ye being gathered together, and my spirit, with the power of our Lord Jesus, to deliver such a one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus. Your glorying is not good. Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump, even as ye are unleavened. For our Passover also hath been sacrificed, *even* Christ: wherefore let us keep the feast, not with old leaven, neither with the leaven of malice and wickedness, but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth.

"I wrote unto you in my epistle to have no company with fornicators; not at all meaning with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous and extortioners, or with idolaters; for then must ye needs go out of the world; but as it is, I wrote unto you not to keep company, if any man that is named a brother be a fornicator, or covetous, or an idolator, or a reviler, or a drunkard, or an extortioner; with such a one no, not to eat. For what have I to do with judging them that are without? Do not ye judge them that are within? But them that are without God judgeth. Put away the wicked man from among yourselves."

That is the whole of chapter 5. It is a fine thing for preachers of this day when they have a case of discipline

that they have express apostolic authority as to how to treat the case. This man's father had doubtless married the second time, and the son by the first wife took his wife away from the father, *i.e.,* took his step-mother. Paul says, "Ye are puffed up . . . your glorifying is not good." They had written to him saying very complimentary things about themselves—that they were doing fine. He didn't agree with them, not with such disorder as this on hand, and the other disorders that have been discussed.

He tells what to do. He says, "This man must be taken away from among yourselves." The church must do that as a proof that it is a church action. He says, "When you are gathered together," and in the second letter we find that what was done in obedience to this letter was done by a majority vote. So that here is a case that unmistakably calls for church action. Offenses of this kind must not be committed in the church of Jesus Christ, and the injunction is peremptory that the church must withdraw fellowship in such cases.

The next thing besides this church action was apostolic action. Paul could do what the church could not do—what no other preacher except an apostle could do—that is, he could deliver such a one over to Satan. They had accused him of not exercising his apostolic power, and he proposes if they do not heed that, he will use his power. He had the power from Jesus Christ to deliver such a one to Satan for the destruction of the flesh, but the spirit would be saved in the day of Jesus Christ.

We want to understand what that means. It shows that this sin in the church may be by a Christian, and that delivering him to Satan is not his ultimate destruction, but the destruction of his flesh, that his soul may

be saved in the day of Jesus Christ. It is necessary that we understand what this means. We find in the Book of Job that God turns Job over to Satan for the destruction of his flesh, and grievous sores came on him, but it was not that Job might be destroyed by the devil. God says to the devil, "Touch not his life." We see the case of the apostles when Jesus says, "Simon, Satan hath obtained you apostles by asking that he may sift you as wheat. But I have prayed for thee that thy faith fail not." Satan came up to Christ and asked that he might deal with them as wheat, and if they were wheat the sifting would help them, and so even this remarkable case of sifting was not done to destroy the offending brother, but to gain him; and there are some cases that cannot be gained except by stern, prompt discipline.

All over the country we have churches that are suffering for the lack of just that thing, and they are injuring these church-sinners. I will illustrate: Suppose in the jungles of Africa a company of people and animals were camped for the night, and they built a stockade to keep off wild beasts, and some of the animals, a cow perhaps, gets unmanageable and bellows and butts around and tries to get out. They turn her out, and let her hear the lion roar, and she wants to get back. The thought is that the one that won't be quiet in good company should be showed that there is worse company on the outside. I heard an old Baptist preacher say, "If you put a wild hog in a pen and he goes to squealing, let him out, and he will strike for the woods and never come back, because he is a hog. But if a sheep is turned out it will bleat around the gate until you open the pen and let the sheep come back on good behavior." If a man is not a converted man he ought not to be in there; let the hog out and let him strike for the woods; if he is a sheep and

hears the lion roar he will bleat around to get back, and he will behave himself next time.

The primary object, if a converted man, is to save him; and the second is to purify the church, and this Paul proceeds to argue. He says, "Know ye not that a little leaven leaveneth the whole lump? Purge out therefore the old leaven that ye may be a new lump, as ye are unleavened. For even Christ, our Passover, is sacrificed for us." Here he uses an O. T. illustration—the preparation for the Passover. Before the Passover was observed there was the preparation for the Passover. The houses were inspected, the walls were scraped lest there was something left, and leprosy would leave particles sticking to the wall. They were going to keep the feast, and Paul says, "Christ, our Passover Lamb, is sacrificed for us." In other words, "We have a feast to keep—the Lord's supper—and in order that we may keep that feast let us examine ourselves and see if we be in the faith. Let us inspect our hearts and our lives, because the law is, with the man that is living disorderly, ye must not eat." It does not refer to a common meal. It refers to the Lord's supper, and the one in disorder may not rightfully partake of the Lord's supper. Henry Ward Beecher boasted that in his church there never had been a case of discipline since it was organized. Not that it was a pure church, for it was very impure; never having discipline in it, they had no standard of doctrine and no standard of life. And the first case that ever came up was Beecher himself, and they will bring us up if we, as pastors of churches, are forever silent on the subject of discipline.

Paul now explains. He says, "I wrote you a letter." It was not preserved. It was not necessary to preserve every one of his letters. John says if everything that

Jesus said and did had been preserved the world would not hold the books. But enough is preserved to form a guide for God's people. He continues: "And in that letter I wrote you not to keep company with fornicators, and ye misunderstood me." He says, "I did not mean that with respect to the world, for that would mean for you to go out of the world; when I said to keep no company and not eat, I meant with a man who is called a brother; if such a one be a fornicator or an adulterer you are to judge those that are within. What have ye to do with those that are without?" He is showing over whom the church has authority to exercise discipline—not outsiders, but insiders.

The next disorder is in chapter 6: "Dare any of you, having a matter against his neighbor, go to law before the unrighteous, and not before the saints? Or know ye not that the saints shall judge the world? And if the world is judged by you, are ye unworthy to judge the smallest matters? Know ye not that ye shall judge angels? how much more, things that pertain to this life? If then ye have to judge things pertaining to this life, do ye set them to judge who are of no account in the church? I say this to move you to shame. What? Cannot there be found among you a wise man who shall be able to decide between his brethren, but brother goeth to law with brother, and that before unbelievers? Nay, already it is altogether a defect in you, that ye have lawsuits one with another. Why not rather take wrong? Why not rather be defrauded? Nay, but ye yourselves do wrong, and defraud, and that your brethren."

This is a remarkable declaration. I will discuss it a little in order to make an impression on the minds of young preachers, for we have almost gone astray on it in our religious life. There isn't a county nor a commu-

nity in the state that some members in the church do not violate that law, and they say they are not heathen. That is not Paul's point at all. His point is that the saints have the highest judicatory power vested in them—that they will judge the world and the angels. It is simply a question of two courts—the church-court or the world-court. Which will we take? To which court are we going to appeal the case? That is what he is discussing. This is illustrated in my book, "Baptists and Their Doctrines," which gives a view of the world-court and the church-court.

He brings up the following points on this discussion: First, that God had placed the judicatory power in the church, as our Lord says, "If any man sin, go right along and convict him of his sin. You have gained the brother." He does not say, "If any member of the church sin against you, whether it is a personal or a public offense, and you know it, you go right along and convict him of that sin. If you fail, take two of the brethren with you; if he will not hear them, tell it to the human court. "No, tell it to the church. There is the judicatory court that Christ established. Here comes up a difference between two brethren on a matter of business. A says that B owes him $100. B denies it. Shall A go to law with B? A starts to go to law and a third man, C, comes to him and says, "A, you are committing an offense; you are doing wrong," and A refuses to hear C, and C goes off and gets D and E, and A won't yield. Then if C, D and E come before the church and say, "We are not judging as to the merits in the case; we do not say A is doing wrong in going to law, but we do say A is doing wrong in the kind of court he goes to." Who shall be the arbitrator? A says that he won't listen to the church; B may owe A that $100, we don't deny

that. Here A denies the jurisdiction of Jesus Christ. Suppose A says, "I will hear the church," and the case is put on its merits. Paul says (and the revised version puts an entirely new sense on it), "If then ye have to judge things pertaining to this life, do you set them to judge who are of no account in the church?" In other words, "Is that the way you are going to do? When the case comes up between A and B, are you going to select people that are no account? Haven't you got some disinterested party? Are you going to select a committee of B-partisans, or of A-partisans?" The common version does not give that sense at all. It says, "Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you?"

We come now to the case that will prevent final church action: Suppose you say to A, "Are you willing to leave this matter to a disinterested committee of brethren as to what are the merits of your question? They do not want to say B robbed you, and they do not want to say you harmed B; are you willing for a third disinterested party to take it up and bring it up on the merits of the case before you get to final church-action?"

There is a passage upon which I preached one sermon, "Jesus the Arbiter of the Nations." I preached it on the occasion of the meeting of The Hague Conference. It shows even in matters of diplomacy that it is better to settle the matter by arbitration than to go to war. In the millennium there will be no war because Jesus is the arbiter between the nations. If that is to take place on a scale in which nations are involved, why cannot we find in the church a small committee of wise and disinterested brethren that will look into the case and settle it without ever going to final church action? But suppose this committee does not settle the case. They say, "Brethren, we have tried to settle it, and here it is before

the church. The question is, does B owe A this $100? If he does he ought to pay it, if he does not, A ought not to worry about it." If a man won't let his brethren settle these matters for him, what is he going to do at the judgment? He presents a case; he says that rather than go to an outsider why not say, "I will just bear this wrong." Well, but suppose they defrauded him? I have been defrauded many a time, more than once since I moved to Ft. Worth. Why should I parade before outsiders my case?

The saddest case in the Texas affairs of our denomination illustrates that. Here we had a brother, very prominent, who kept bringing cases before the General Convention of Texas, and every time he would bring it they decided against him. He would not let it stay decided. Finally, he took the case into court, and if any man was ever present one day when that case was on trial and heard the infidel lawyers and the lawyers of other denominations gloat over the Baptist trouble, he would never forget it. Suppose that man had had the sounds preserved in a graphophone, and had that in his family, and when any one would come to see him he would have that instrument to reproduce those vile sentences against our very best men? Oh, it was infamous! Of course it ruined that man. It didn't ultimately hurt the other men, but it surely killed the man that resorted to it.

Paul then announces a fundamental principle. He is discussing the point whether a fornicator or adulterer should be retained in the church, and he says, "Know ye not that a fornicator, an adulterer, a covetous man shall not inherit the Kingdom of Heaven?" He will be excluded there certainly; he will never get in; the gates will be barred. In other words, Christianity is designed

to be a maker of character. If it does not make a man better than he was before, it is not worth anything; if it does not make a father a better father, a mother a better mother, a sister a better sister, a brother a better brother, a child a better child—if there is no improvement in the character of the man, then we may be sure that he has never been born again, because the Spirit does not produce that kind of fruit. And Paul says that the fruits of the flesh are manifest. Then he tells what they are and says that the fruits of the Spirit are manifest. "By their fruits ye shall know them," says Jesus.

And then again they were liable to misunderstand. He says, "I don't mean that the murderer never gets to heaven; I don't mean that men who were fornicators never get to heaven, for such were some of you. You belonged to that very crowd, but ye were washed; the Holy Spirit took you in charge; you desired to obey God, not to disobey Him."

In other words, the Holy Spirit is greater than total depravity. It can overcome total depravity, because total depravity is of the first birth; but this being born again by the power of the Holy Spirit makes one of another seed, of the Word of God, that liveth and abideth forever.

And the murderer can be saved, as thousands of them have been saved. It was the greatest triumph of Christianity to look upon that Corinthian crowd. All the depths of infamy through which some of them had passed could not be named in a mixed audience, but by the power of God they were washed, and they lived, and one of the most remarkable cases as bearing upon it, is the case of the celebrated Augustine. His mother was a saint, and she loved her wild, wayward boy. It seemed that the bridle had been taken off, and the devil was riding him "bare-back" down to hell. He, after his

conversion, often referred to the shameless infamies he committed. This is a case worthy of consideration. Everyone ought to read Augustine's confessions. He did not keep on living that life after he was converted; he was one of the greatest preachers that ever lived. What we call Calvinism is the doctrine of Augustine. He saved the church for three hundred years from going astray. So Paul say, "Such were some of you; but ye were washed, but ye were sanctified."

He comes now to something more difficult. He is discussing this debasing sin of fornication, and says, "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body (except this one)." Now instead of sin residing in the body and corrupting the spirit, it is the spirit that sins and corrupts the body. Envy, that is not a bodily sin; hate, that is not a bodily sin; malice, that is not a bodily sin; pride, presumption, every sin that a man commits is apart from his body except fornication. There the body is made the instrument of the sin. And Paul brings up this argument, "Know ye not that your body is the temple of the Holy Spirit which is in you?" Generally when he refers to the temple, he refers to a church, as he says to this church, "Ye are God's building, ye are the temple of God," and where he says, "Every separate congregation groweth up into the holy temple of God, a habitation of the Spirit," but in this particular case he makes the body of the Christian a temple of the Spirit, because the Holy Spirit enters into him and dwells in him, and if He dwells in him, then the body is the temple in which He dwells.

QUESTIONS

1. What the relation between the revolt against apostolic authority and the relaxation of morals?
2. Illustrate how sins are gregarious.
3. What the case of discipline discussed in chapter 5?
4. What relation did this man sustain to the woman whom he took?
5. What church action did Paul prescribe?
6. What apostolic action in this case, what illustration from the O. T., and what one also from the N. T.?
7. What the object of corrective discipline in the church-member, and what illustration given?
8. What is the object relative to the church, what Paul's argument, what O. T. illustration, and what the N. T. application?
9. What the meaning and application of I Cor. 5:11?
10. What the meaning and application of I Cor. 5:12, 13?
11. What the fourth ecclesiastical disorder, and where discussed?
12. What of the prevalence of this sin?
13. What Paul's argument against this disorder?
14. What Christ's direction in such cases?
15. Describe a typical case of "going to law" scripturally.
16. In case a proper adjustment cannot be made, what does Paul recommend?
17. What illustration in Texas Baptist history of this disorder?
18. What fundamental principle does Paul enunciate in this connection?
19. What the design of Christianity?
20. What Paul's teaching elsewhere on this point, and what does Christ say also?
21. What the character of the Corinthians before hearing the gospel, and what their character afterwards?
22. What remarkable case of this transformation cited, and what is Calvinism?
23. What is the meaning of "Every sin that a man doeth is without the body, etc.," and what the application?

XVIII

THE PERVERSION OF THE LORD'S SUPPER

Scriptures: I Cor. 10: 1-22; 11: 17-34

THE next great ecclesiastical disorder, resulting from these other two, is the Perversion of the Lord's Supper, and all that there is about it is in 10: 1-22 and 11: 17-34. The first perversion was open communion. They had been living among the heathen, and had been keeping the heathen festivals as a religious act. When one member of the family was converted and joined the church, perchance his wife, who was a heathen, says, "Let us be liberal. You come and commune with me at my festival, and I will commune with you at your festival." But Paul says, "You cannot eat at the table of the Lord and the table of the devil; you cannot drink from the cup of the Lord and from the cup of the devil."

I had a woman once to say, "Yes, but that is a different sort of communion." I will admit that it is the greater extreme, but the principle is precisely the same, that is, that it perverts the foundation principle of the Christian religion; that the form of religious act should be the result of individual conviction; that one should not do a thing on account of his wife. It is his own case; it isn't her case.

I was sitting in the Old Methodist Church in Waco one time and a very handsome, cultured lady at the very

top of the social world, leaned over and whispered to me,

"I am going to join your church next Sunday."

I said, "What for?" and she said,

"Well, my husband is a Baptist, and will never be anything else."

I said, "What are you?"

"I am a Presbyterian."

"Well," I said, "if you come to my church Sunday to join I will vote against you. You should not take a step of that kind for that reason. Suppose your husband were a Presbyterian, would you come to the Baptist Church?"

"Never!"

"Then stay where you are forever," I said.

Notice the fact that it is *the Lord's* table, *the Lord's* cup. A man comes and says,

"May I come to your table? I am perfectly willing for you to come to mine."

I say, "Yes, come on in."

He says, "Not that table; I am referring to the Lord's table."

"It was not to the Lord's table that I invited you."

We cannot put the Lord's table out in the woods. He tells who shall come.

"Well, won't you take a sup with me?"

"Certainly! Come over to my well and I will let you have cool, delicious, clear water."

"I mean drink with me out of the same communion cup." "Ah, that is Christ's cup; I have no jurisdiction over that."

There is not a more convincing argument against open communion of any kind. No open communion argument can stand before the declaration, "It is *the Lord's* table." That was the first perversion.

No matter what anybody says, we should stick to the doctrine that Christ placed that table in His church, not for them to say who shall come, but for God to say who shall come. One has to be inside the church before he is entitled to sit at the Lord's table.

This first perversion was open communion, not with another Christian denomination, but with the heathen. The paragraph of that matter is I Cor. 10:1-23: "For I would not, brethren, have you ignorant that our fathers were all under the cloud, and all passed through the sea; and were all baptized unto Moses in the cloud and in the sea; and did all eat the same spiritual food; and did all drink the same spiritual drink; for they drank of a spiritual Rock that followed them: and the Rock was Christ. Howbeit, with most of them God was not well pleased: for they were overthrown in the wilderness. Now these things were our examples, to the intent we should not lust after evil things, as they also lusted. Neither be ye idolaters, as were some of them; as it is written, The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play [the word, "play," means to participate in the licentious orgies of their feasts]. . . . Wherefore let him that thinketh he standeth [especially in that way] take heed lest he fall. . . . All things are lawful; but not all things are expedient. All things are lawful; but not all things edify."

Upon that paragraph I make several important comments. First of all, as that particular paragraph has been made much use of in the baptismal controversy, I wish to expound its signification as bearing upon that subject, and then show its relevancy to the Lord's supper.

When I was a young preacher there came to Waco an old grey-bearded brother Methodist, Dr. Fisher, who took the position that immersion was not only not bap-

tism, but that it was a sin. He said so many things about it that our church courteously challenged him to debate with their pastor, and two debates followed—one in Waco and one in Davilla, in Milam County. He, in both Waco and Davilla, took the position that "our fathers," men, women and children, were baptized, and inasmuch as they were baptized in the cloud it was not immersion, and quoted the passage in Psalms referring to this event, where it is said that the clouds poured out water. He said this baptism was a baptism of pouring.

When I came to reply I stated that these people were baptized in *THE cloud,* not *clouds;* and that it meant that pillar of cloud that was a pillar of fire, and symbolic of the presence of the Lord, and not a raincloud at all; second, that the record stated that they passed through dry shod—neither men, women nor children had a drop of water on them—but the record did state that after they passed through, the clouds did burst into a terrific storm upon Pharoah and his hosts, and he was welcome to that pouring for any use he could make of it. In the next place the baptism was strictly a burial in light. The water, according to the song of Miriam, not only opened, but stood up as walls and congealed. That means they froze. They stood there like walls of ice. When they went down into that ice-gorge, the pillar of cloud that always led in front, came back and got in the rear, and toward Pharaoh it was as black as the night of Egypt, and toward the children of Israel it was light. Now, they were down there in that ice-coffin. All that the coffin needed was a lid, and since it was under the cloud, the cloud formed the lid of light, and as that light shone on those walls they acted as mirrors and flashed it back so that it was a glorious burial in light, with the sea on two sides and the cloud on top. They were thus "bap-

tized under the cloud and in the sea." The Book of Revelation refers to it when it talks about the redeemed after their redemption: "I saw them stand by the sea of glass mingled with fire," referring back to this incident where the pillar of cloud—the cloud of light—shining on the congealed walls of water made it look like a sea of glass mingled with fire. I said that it was one of the strongest arguments for immersion, and there was nothing in it that could in any way substantiate his position. With that explanation we will see how Paul brings this in.

He takes the O. T. analogy, and says that the children of Israel were baptized unto Moses, as we are baptized unto Christ; that they were baptized in the cloud and in the sea; they were baptized under the cloud of light in the sea congealed, and not only did they have that symbolic baptism, but they had the spiritual meat and drink. They did all eat of the spiritual meat—the manna, the bread from heaven which typified Christ. "I am the true bread, which came down from heaven," said Christ, commenting on the giving of the manna; and they had a spiritual drink, that is, it came by no natural means, but by the power of God when Moses smote the rock near Sinai, and it sent out that water that saved them from perishing with thirst. The rock at Kadesh-Barnea presented a different thought. It was not to be smitten, but invoked. It is sin for Christ to be crucified twice. They had that drink, obtained by supernatural means, so that in a sense they had ordinances. But his point is that ordinances do not save men. Though they had that spiritual manna, and that spiritual drink—the water from the rock—yet their idolatrous, licentious lives showed that at heart they were not right in the sight of God, and that God overthrew them and they

perished, and the record of that transaction was made for our admonition, as well as everything else in the O. T. All those records were made for us in our time. Abraham's faith was reckoned unto him for righteousness, which was not written for his sake alone, but ours also.

When we look back at these examples we are to be admonished. Though I have been baptized, though I have partaken of the Lord's supper, to me, if life does not bear the fruits of regeneration, these ordinances are empty, and "therefore let him that thinketh he standeth [and on such a basis as that] take heed lest he fall."

Whoever relies on the bread and wine or water, is sure to lose in the great day.

He says that these people, though they had the divine ordinances, exercising open communion with the idolatrous nations around them, would sit down and eat and then rise up and play. Following that comes the immoral debaucheries. That is Paul's use of it.

There is one other word that calls for explanation. He says, "They drank of a spiritual Rock that followed them: and the Rock was Christ." My old family physician took the position that when Moses smote the rock at Sinai, the stream of water issuing from that rock followed them always, whether they went up hill or down hill. I told him that he was zealous for a good cause, but incorrect in the position that he took. Paul means to say that what followed them—what was behind them—was symbolical only, and that what took place, took place entirely by the power of the symbol, so if any man had looked through the symbol at the thing signified he would have taken hold of the thing as Abraham did, and many others of the old saints, particularly Moses. That symbol of His presence was with them all the time,

sometimes leading, sometimes following, depending upon where the danger was.

His first point is that symbolical ordinances do not save people. His second point is set forth in chapter 11. The subject is resumed in 11:19. From this we get at the next perversion of the Lord's supper. I have grouped them so that we might get one topic together. In that chapter he discusses the true relation of the Lord's supper, and its true lesson, so that the next perversion of the Lord's supper is that they partook of it individually, or in groups. One little selfish crowd would come in, and they would partake, and another group would come in, and here some poor people would come in, and no provision had been made for them, and they could not partake. What does this mean?

It means that there cannot be a real celebration of this ordinance unless the church be gathered together. It is a church act.

He closed his discussion by saying this: "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for another." In other words, assembling is essential to the partaking of the Lord's supper. They would come in groups; would not wait and let the whole church partake together to indicate its unity. "You being many are one loaf, ONE BODY."

The next perversion was that they would partake of what they called the Lord's supper in order to satisfy their hunger and thirst, and would even drink until they were drunk. He says, "What? Have you not houses to eat and to drink in; or despise ye the church of God, and put them to shame that have not?" This fact was intended to symbolize spiritual truth, and was not intended that this unleavened bread and this small quantity of wine should satisfy hunger and thirst.

I saw some negroes celebrate the Lord's supper. They had pies for bread and cheap whiskey for wine, and they all caroused and got drunk. Such a thing as this took place in this Corinthian church. He says, "That isn't proper." This is the third idea. He said, "Here is a crowd full, and yonder is a group of poor people who haven't anything. That violates fellowship."

Then touching again on the subject of open communion, he gives us a clear meaning of the word, "communion." Rev. Tiberias Grachus Jones, pastor of First Baptist Church, Nashville, Tenn., says the word is a great misnomer. He calls it the Lord's supper. Some think it means communion of A, B, C, D, and E, but the word indicates a communion of each one of us with Christ. "The cup, is it not the communion, or participation of Christ?" And "is not the eating of the bread a communion of the body of Christ?" It is not a communion with your wife, neighbor, brother or sister, but the communion is with Christ, and on that account Dr. Jones rightfully took the position that it was a great misnomer. On that subject of the communion with Christ we may bring out the thought that whoever communes not with Christ, but with his wife,

Whoever partakes of the Lord's supper in order to show his fellowship with his wife or his mother, or his sister, or his aunt, or with any denomination, or any human being, perverts the Lord's supper. The participation should be a vision, but the vision should be of Jesus Christ.

Before I pass that point I will recite two incidents of Texas Baptist history. Both of them attracted a great deal of attention. Many years ago the Baptist pastor of the church of Houston was not very sound in doctrine, but was zealous about works, and would be over-per-

suaded to do things that he ought not to do. A woman came to him crying and told him that her husband was dying and wanted to partake of the Lord's supper. He took the emblems, the bread and the wine, and administered the supper to that dying brother. The Baptists of the state criticised him severely, and harassed him until he made a public apology. The other case is this: When I was pastor of my first church, we had in our membership a very brilliant lawyer who before my day had joined the church at old Baylor University at Independence. He afterwards went to a dance, and some of the brethren thought that it was improper, and he got mad and stayed away and finally the church withdrew fellowship from him. This man was dying, and he sent for me and said, "Brother Carroll, I want you to tell all young people that no spiritual good can come to them by participating in worldly amusements that are far from grace, and that they alienate them from God. My life has been unfruitful, yet I am a true child of God, and now I am conscious that I am dying. I know Jesus said do one thing that I never did, that is, He commanded that all partake of the Lord's supper. I never did, and before I pass away I would like to obey Him one time if it can be done scripturally. Now can you tell me how it can be done scripturally?" I said, "What importance do you attach to this? Do you think that this will save you." He said, "O no, I am not so foolish as that. I just want to obey Him this one time." I said, "I can manage that for you, and do it scripturally." And on Sunday as the church met in conference I said, "Brethren, I suggest that we adjourn to the house of this dying lawyer." The church can adjourn to meet at any place it may desire and as a church can there set forth the Lord's table; and so we went

there horseback and in buggies, and the minutes of the conference were read showing that we were there by adjournment, and we heard this man's confession of his sins and he asked the church to take him back. Then they set the Lord's supper, and his face was illumined when he was able to obey the Lord's command.

Those two incidents attracted a great deal of attention in Texas. I knew that in my case I had managed it just right, and had conformed to the scripture and made the lesson one hundred times more important. Those two cases illustrate the point I am on now.

The Apostle Paul, in order to correct the perversion, sets forth the doctrine of the supper, and this is what he says: "I received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus in the night in which He was betrayed took bread; and when He had given thanks, He broke it, and said, This is my body, which is for you: this do in remembrance of me. In like manner also the cup, after supper [that is, the Passover supper], saying, This cup is the new covenant in my blood: this do, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me. For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye proclaim the Lord's death till He come." Paul shows that he did not get this revelation of Christ's institution from the original apostles. It was a special revelation made to him. Christ himself told Paul what He had done, why He had done it, and what it suggested.

I am now going to give a five-minute sermon on the Lord's supper: First, let all the church assemble together for the observance of this supper. Then exercise three faculties—memory, faith, hope. This do in remembrance. What does memory do? Memory looks back. Whom remember? Not father, not mother, not sister, not wife, not any human being. Simply Jesus. "This do in remem-

brance of me." Remember Jesus, not in the manger, not raising the dead, no; remember Jesus on the cross, dying. Remember His dying for what? Dying for the remission of our sins. This is memory. "This do in remembrance of me," on the cross dying for remission of sins. Next we take up faith. What does faith do? It discerns the Lord's body, and the Lord's blood represented by the eating or the drinking. They are external symbols that represent the acts of faith. Faith sees through that ordinance as a symbol—Christ dying for the remission of our sins. That is faith's part. Now there is hope. Hope does not look backward, like memory; it looks forward. "As oft as ye drink this ye do show forth the Lord's death till He come." There is a stretch into the future in the Lord's supper. Faith present discerns Christ dying for the remission of sins; memory looks back to Christ dying on the cross for the remission of sins; hope looks forward to the coming of our Lord Jesus Christ, His final advent. That isn't a hard sermon to remember.

Now another five-minute sermon, for it is exceedingly important to remember these things. Suppose then, as in the Lord's supper, we "show forth His death till He come." That makes a drama. What do the actors do on the stage? They, in their costumes and in their position, show forth something. Look at the Lord's supper as a drama, and you will see it is a two-fold drama. What is the first thing presented? Unleavened bread. What does that unleavened bread represent? The sinless Christ. No leaven in Him. That shows forth Christ alive. What the second act in that drama? The eulogy. He blessed it. "Eulogy" means He blessed the bread, or gave thanks, and the signification of that is that the sinless Christ is set apart for a certain object. That is

the second scene. What is the third scene? The bread broken. There Christ dies. What the fourth? The participation with Christ, the eating of the bread by every one of them. Faith is always present in the eating of the bread. Let us take the other side of it, and we will see from another viewpoint another drama. Take a vessel of wine. There the vessel, and wine in it as Christ's blood, show that He is alive; then comes the eulogy, or setting apart; then comes the pouring out, that is, Christ dying; then comes the drinking or participating. Now the drama is doubled—both sides presented, just as Pharaoh had a dream and saw seven full ears and seven poor ears, and seven fat cows and seven lean cows, and the poor ears ate up the seven full ears and the lean cows ate up the fate cows. In interpreting it the dream is doubled to show that it was from God. Then he goes on to show the significance of the dream. Seven full ears and seven fat kine are (there the verb, "to be" is used as, "represent," *i. e.,* they represented) seven years of plenty. It is double, and the seven wilted ears of corn and the seven lean cows are (in a sense of representation) seven years of famine. Now precisely in the same way He says, "this represents my body; this cup represents the new covenant in my blood." That use of the verb, "to be," is a common one in all languages. In that sense the verb, "to be," is used, and it annihilates the Roman Catholic idea of transubstantiation, *i. e.,* that it actually becomes Christ's body and actually becomes His blood.

Having presented the true doctrine of the Lord's supper, there remains to be considered these other statements: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily [mark that "unworthily" is an adverb], eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself." That passage has scared a

great many people. I have heard them say, "I am not worthy! I am not worthy!" I would say, "No, nor am I." "Well," they say, "what about that scripture 'Whoever eateth and drinketh unworthily eateth and drinketh damnation to himself?'" The sense is not *unworthy,* but *unworthily,* referring to the manner, being an adverb of manner. An illustration has just been given. These Corinthians did not assemble; they did not eat as spiritual food or drink, but to satisfy their hunger and thirst; they violated fellowship; they wouldn't wait for one another.

The next scriptural sentence is, "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat." That has been quoted to me as meaning that the individual should be the judge. I said, "Now why don't you get the connection where Paul says, 'If any of you that is named a brother be an adulterer, or an idolater, or covetous, with such a one, no, not to eat.'" That part of it, *i. e.,* this examination, does not apply to the whole world, as if to say, "Let every man in the world examine himself," but when church members come to church to celebrate the Lord's supper, then let them put the examination to themselves. Not, "Am I good enough?" but "Can I, a sinner saved by grace, discern Christ—not my wife? can I see Him dying for me? do I discern His body?"

I never participated in this ordinance in my life that I did not have that self-examination: "O Lord, am I thinking of anyone else but thee? Am I thinking of thee in any other place than on the cross? Am I thinking of any other purpose than that thou hast died for the remission of my sins?"

Here he shows its importance when he says, "On this account some are sick, and many of you are asleep." That does not mean that there is any magical power

attached to the elements of the Lord's supper, so that if a man takes it unworthily it will make him sick, or that it will kill him. They used to think that. They used to play on the superstitious fears of the people and say, "If while making a covenant you are true to the covenant, this poison will not hurt you, but if you are planning to be treacherous, then you have swallowed something that will give you the small-pox." What then does it mean? It refers to those marvelous displays of power that the apostles had a right to exercise. A man would be at the Lord's supper; maybe he was a blasphemer, and judgment would come upon him, as in the case of Ananias and Sapphira; he would go to sleep right there.

QUESTIONS

1. What the fifth ecclesiastical disorder, what its relation to the two preceding ones, and where do we find an account of it?
2. What the first perversion, and what does Paul say about it?
3. What the principle underlying this discussion of Paul, and what the author's illustration of it?
4. What important fact relative to the Lord's supper bearing on the so-called communion question, and how?
5. What special use has been made of I Cor. 10:1-22, what the author's controversy over it, and what his interpretation of the baptismal idea in it?
6. What reference to this in Revelation?
7. What else did the children of Israel have besides that symbolic baptism, and what is the meaning of "spiritual food" and "spiritual drink" in I Cor. 10:3, 4?
8. What the difference in the thought of the rock at Rephidim, and the rock at Kadesh-Barnea?
9. What Paul's point here, and what its relation to the Corinthians and to us?
10. What is the meaning of, "The people sat down to eat and drink, and rose up to play," and what its bearing on the question under consideration?
11. What is the meaning of, "They drank of a spiritual Rock that followed them, and the Rock was Christ?"
12. What the second perversion of the Lord's supper, and what its bearing as an essential to the partaking of the Lord's supper?
13. What the third perversion, and how does it violate the principles of fellowship?

14. What is the meaning of "communion" as it is used in I Cor. 10:16, is it really communion at all, and, if so, in what sense, and with whom?

15. What two incidents in Texas Baptist history, one illustrative of the perversion of the Lord's supper, and the other, of its correct observance?

16. How did Paul correct the perversion of the supper, and how did Paul get his information as to the institution of the supper?

17. What three faculties are exercised in a proper observance of the Lord's supper, and what function does each perform?

18. Show forth in a double drama the death of Christ as it is portrayed in the supper.

19. Why was the drama doubled, and what illustration from the O. T.?

20. What the meaning of the verb, "to be," in such expressions as, "This is my body, etc.?"

21. What the meaning of the expression, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, etc.?"

22. What the meaning and application of the expression, "Let a man examine himself and so let him eat?"

23. What the meaning of I Cor. 11:30?

XIX

THE MISUSE AND ABUSE OF MIRACULOUS GIFTS

Scripture: I Cor. 12:1-31

THE scope of this chapter, with two others, is I Cor. 12, 13, 14, being the sixth Ecclesiastical Disorder at Corinth, towit: The Misuse and Abuse of Miraculous Gifts, bestowed upon the members of the church, in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. In other words, it is partly a discussion of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and I take for the text I Cor. 12:13, following the revised version: "For in one Spirit [that is the element of the baptism, showing it was not a water baptism] were we all baptized into one body." I prefer to say "unto;" it makes better sense. Almost entirely throughout the N. T. the preposition, *eis*, with the verb, *baptizo*, is read "unto," not altogether, but in almost all cases.

Let us read the text again: "For in one Spirit were we all [past tense, referring to Paul's baptism in the Spirit and the Corinthians' baptism in the Spirit] baptized *unto* one body," that is, baptism in the Spirit did not refer to any man individually, though the baptism in his case was individual and in power. The baptism had reference to the church, the one body. That is the text.

There are certain preliminary scriptures that should

be studied before we can fully comprehend I Cor. 12, 13, 14. Indeed, I do not know a subject about which there is so much incorrect thinking and confusion of mind as about the baptism in the Spirit. Not one preacher in a thousand, whether he be ignorant or learned, has any clear conception of the signification of the baptism in the Spirit. There are two typical, or symbolical, O. T. references that need first to be considered. One is Exodus 40. There, all of the material of the tabernacle was brought together into one place; brought together ready finished and put up; each piece, no matter whether stone, gold, silver, brass, wood, or cloth, each piece was so fully prepared that when they went to put it up they didn't have to use tools; it just fitted exactly. As soon as this symbolical or typical house of God was set up and completed, then the cloud came down and filled that house.

The other O. T. symbol is in the first book of Kings. Just as soon as all the material for the temple was prepared according to the divine pattern, and was put up without the sound of hammer, the cloud that had filled the tabernacle, a house now useless, came and filled the temple, which succeeded the portable tent of the wilderness.

On the day of Pentecost, the church, which is the antitype of both tabernacle and temple, and which is the new house of God that had been built by our Lord Jesus Christ in His lifetime, but up to that hour tenantless, was filled by the Holy Spirit, and every man and woman of the 120 who that day were baptized in the Holy Spirit, were baptized *eis ten ecclesian*—unto the church. They were all baptized in one Spirit, but the purpose of that baptism was *unto the church.* Whatever may be said about that baptism in the way of power, it was for the

purpose of attesting, or accrediting the church of the Lord Jesus Christ.

Let us carefully study, whether I discuss them or not, the following passages of scripture: Matt. 3:11, 12, Mark 1:7, 8, and Luke 3:16, 17, all of which refer to the prophecy of John the Baptist. He says, "I indeed baptize you in water unto repentance, but He that cometh after me is mightier than I, . . . He shall baptize you in the Holy Spirit." That is the baptism of the Spirit in promise. John is contrasted with Jesus; John is the administrator in the water baptism, and is contrasted with Jesus, the administrator of the baptism in the Holy Spirit. The water is the element in one, the Spirit is the element of the other. John's was a baptism which any man with ordinary power could carry out, but the baptism in the Spirit needed One mightier than John, because this baptism in the Spirit was a baptism in power.

The next case that we need to study by way of promise is John 7:37-39: "Now on the last day, the great day of the feast, Jesus stood and cried, saying, If any man thirst, let him come unto me and drink. He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, from within him shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believed on Him were to receive: for the Spirit was not yet given." In this passage there is a sharp contrast between the previous statement of Jesus to the woman of Samaria when He said that whoever would drink of the water He should give him would never thirst, but it should be a well of water springing up unto everlasting life. That referred to conversion, and was for the benefit of him that received it. It was to be something in him that would forever supply his spiritual thirst. But in this case, in

chapter 7, He refers to the gift of the Spirit that had not yet been bestowed. The result was not to put a well in the man, but from him should outflow streams of water. In other words, the object of the giving of the Spirit, as stated in this chapter of John, was not to make the recipient a better man, but to give the power to bestow benefits upon others. In this passage it is distinctly stated that in the sense meant by Jesus the Spirit *was not yet*. When John spoke, it was of something in the future: "He shall baptize you," and when John the Apostle wrote, "The Spirit was not yet," he referred to the time when the Spirit had not been given, and before which there had been no baptism in the Spirit. There was no incident of it having occurred in the history of the world to this time. It was something that, up to the day of Pentecost, was merely prophecy or promise. So, therefore, it is not to be confounded in any way with any display that took place in the history of the world up to that time. Therefore we cannot call it conversion. In conversion the Spirit is the agent, the sinner is the subject, and the object of regeneration is to make the man better; in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, Jesus is the administrator, the Spirit is the element, and the object is to confer power for the good of others, and to accredit.

I say there never had been a baptism in the Holy Spirit in the world up to that time; it had been foreshadowed in the cloud filling the tabernacle when the tabernacle was ready; foreshadowed in the cloud filling the temple when the temple was ready. That cloud over the tabernacle gave it the authority, the prestige of God. And so the cloud gave prestige to the temple. The temple was the dwelling of the cloud, and so the baptism of the Holy Spirit filled the house that Jesus built in His

life-time, crying out on the cross, "It is finished." The veil of the temple, or the old house, was rent in twain from top to bottom, and according to the prophecy in Daniel, after the Messiah came, and was cut off, there was to be an anointing of the Holy *Place,* for the Holy Place was the new temple, or church.

Let us look next at John 14, 15, 16, 17. Those four chapters constitute the N. T. book of comfort, as Isaiah from the 40th chapter to the end of the book constitutes the O. T. book of comfort. The O. T. book of comfort speaks exclusively of the coming Lord; the N. T. book of comfort speaks exclusively of the coming Holy Spirit. Not everything in those four chapters of John are limited in their meaning to the baptism in the Spirit, but very many of the references are strictly so limited.

The next antecedent scripture is Luke 24:49, in which Jesus, after rebuking them for not understanding what the law, the prophets and the Psalms said concerning himself, said, "Tarry ye in the city, until ye be clothed with power from on high," and "Ye shall receive power when the Holy Spirit is come upon you," as Luke gives it in Acts 1:8. Thus He says, "You are a church; you are organized; you have a commission to go out to preach to the whole world, but tarry until you are endued with power; wait ye at Jerusalem until ye receive power from on high." In Mark 16:17, 18 those signs there give the meaning of the baptism in the Holy Spirit: "These signs shall accompany them that believe: if they drink any deadly thing, it shall in no wise hurt them." These are the passages that need to be studied.

We now take up the fulfillment of those prophecies. The first is in Acts 2. On that day of Pentecost they were waiting and praying. The Spirit had been promised, but had not come. They had their commission.

There was the house, but it was empty. On the day of Pentecost this baptism in the Spirit was manifested by the following phenomena: First, the sound; there comes the sound, the ear caught that; that sound was as a rushing, mighty wind. I stood once about one hundred yards from the path of a cyclone, and watched it, and for the first time in my life I realized the awful sound of a rushing, mighty wind. The next phenomenon appealed, not to the ear, but to the sight. A luminous sheet like as of fire, but not fire, appeared, and that sheet of flame distributed itself as fire distributes itself, into tongues. When a fire is kindled it isn't even around the edges, but it parts, or divides itself, into tongues of flame; and now this luminous appearance, as a vibrating, moving fire-tongue, rested on the head of every one of the 120. That appealed to the sight. Now they all began to speak with tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance. The whole city heard that cyclonic roar; it filled all the city, and they came rushing forward to the place where it seemed to be. And the people were gathered together, and they saw the whole 120 in ecstasy, speaking in foreign tongues, speaking to the gathered crowds that were there from every nation under heaven, and each man heard the praise of God spoken in the tongue in which that man was born. That was the first manifestation. A particular form of power is represented by tongues, that is, the capacity to speak in a language in which one has never been educated. There can be no mistake about that from Acts 2.

They do not receive this baptism in the Holy Spirit as individuals, but each man baptized in the Spirit that day was baptized *eis ten ecclesian,* "unto the church," that is, he received that power, not for his gratification, but in order to attest and accredit that church; it was to

be a sign. Accrediting comes through the marvelous power given.

We take up the next example of fulfillment in Acts 8:14-24. Philip had preached to the Samaritans, not the Jews, but a mixed population. They had believed Philip and were baptized, both men and women, but no miraculous power of the Holy Spirit had come on them. The Apostles in Jerusalem heard of it; they sent John and Peter down, and when they laid their hands on them they received the baptism of the Holy Spirit.

The next case is presented in Acts 10:44-47, with a reference to it in 11:15-17. Here is the one step for which Peter, preaching to the Gentiles, was called to account by the Jews. "And as Peter spake to Cornelius and his house, the Holy Spirit fell on them, and they spake with tongues and glorified God." Peter says, "I remember the prophecy of John the Baptist; that he baptized people in water, but One should come after him mightier than he, who would baptize in the Holy Spirit. Who was I that I should withstand God, when these Gentiles had received the gospel just the same as we Jews had."

The next case is given in Acts 19:6. Paul found at Ephesus twelve men who had known nothing but the baptism of John. They had been baptized, but they knew nothing of the Holy Spirit. The one that baptized them was certainly not John, for he had been dead twenty years. Somebody, without being sent to baptize, was trying to perpetuate John's baptism—to administer it unauthorized. Paul says, "Did ye receive the Holy Spirit when ye believed?" They said, "No; we never so much as even heard that the Holy Spirit was given." Paul then expounded to them what John had preached and laid his hands on them, and they received the baptism

of the Spirit and began to speak with tongues and prophesied.

The last particular case is in I Cor. 12, 13, 14. It discusses the baptism that the members of the church at Corinth had received—a case in its typical foreshadowing, in its promise and prophecy, and in its effect, or its fulfillment.

With these things before us we are prepared to take up these three chapters, and the baptism in the Holy Spirit we will consider more particularly. These Corinthians had misunderstood, misused, and abused it, and had so misused it and abused it that it was not *eis ten ecclesian,* "unto the church," but it was bringing confusion and discord in the church and causing factions. In order to understand the phrase, *eis ten ecclesian,* let us consider two paragraphs of chapter 12: "Now concerning spiritual gifts, brethren, I would not have you ignorant," *i. e.,* "you ought not to misunderstand such a matter as the baptism in the Holy Spirit." Then comes the text: "In one Spirit were we all baptized into one body, whether Jews or Greeks, whether bond or free." Jews and Gentiles, bond and free, could not be together in the Jewish *ecclesia,* nor could they be together in the Greek *ecclesia.* In the *ecclesia* of Jesus Christ there were Gentiles, Jews, bond, free, Parthian, Scythian, male or female, without any distinction of race, or previous condition of servitude. They all received this baptism of the Spirit, but received it with reference to its purpose, viz.: to accredit the church.

Speaking of the church as a body, he continues the discussion this way: "For the body is not one member, but many. All the members being one body, so also is Christ, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." "If the foot shall say, Because I am

not the hand, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body. And the ear shall say, because I am not the eye, I am not of the body; it is not therefore not of the body." But now in this baptism of the Holy Spirit, they were baptized *eis,* "unto," one body. "But now hath God set the members each one of them in the body, even as it pleased Him. . . . But now they are many members, but one body. And the eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you."

He goes on to say that when one member suffers, all suffer; if one is honored, all rejoice. "Now we are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." Notice their offices in the church, and the order in which he puts them: "First, apostles; secondly, prophets; thirdly, teachers; then miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diverse kinds of tongues. Are all apostles? are all prophets? are all teachers? are all workers of miracles? have all the gifts of healings? do all speak with tongues? do all interpret?" That shows the need of a church; that the baptism of the Holy Spirit was to accredit the church; that not the individual members received the baptism.

If that baptism in the Holy Spirit was conversion, it was not the same in all of them. One received the gift to heal; one the gift to speak in foreign tongues; one received the gift to interpret tongues; another received faith, not faith in Jesus, but mountain-moving faith, so that if he should say to the mountain, "Be thou cast into the sea," it would be done. And another would receive some other form of gifts. There was diversity of gifts, but they all came from one Spirit, and every one of them had reference to one body, the church.

Very abundantly did this Corinthian church receive

miraculous power. In chapter 14 it is brought out much more clearly. Every one of these miraculous gifts being to accredit the church, were circumstantially, temporarily in the church, as in the next chapter Paul says, "Whether there be prophecies, they shall fail; whether there be tongues, they shall cease." Whenever the church was sufficiently accredited, then these miracles passed away, *i. e.,* as soon as they had fulfilled their mission.

A man once asked me if I had received the baptism in the Holy Spirit. I told him, "No; that I didn't need it, for it was never given except to accredit the church, and that I would be ashamed to say that 1,900 years had elapsed and Christ's church was not attested."

If any man of the present day says that he has the gift of the Holy Spirit, let him allow me to pick out the rattlesnake, let it bite him and see if it will hurt him; let me buy the poison and see if it hurts him; and let me go with him to the grave and see him raise a dead body. These are the signs: "These signs will follow them that believe." The commission was just given and they were not attested, but "whether there be prophecies they shall fail," or as David puts it in the Psalms, when he says, "the vision and the oblation shall cease." As soon as there is a sufficient revelation, as soon as the church and its faith are sufficiently accredited, then the vision ceases, and there is no more need of this sign now than there is for wings to fly now while we are earthly bodies. On the contrary, to ask for the sign now is to say, "Lord, the old attestation is played out; we want the thing attested again." Just like another argument where Paul says that if one who has once been enlightened and has tasted the power of the world to come, should fall away, it is impossible to renew him again unto repentance, etc. If he does fall away shall we preach Christ to him? He

had Christ. Shall we preach regeneration to him? He had regeneration. Precisely, this is the character of the argument, about this baptism in the Holy Spirit. There is now no necessity for it.

Paul now makes his last point, that in their misuse and abuse of this miraculous power, they magnified miraculous power over grace; they put their miraculous displays higher than they put faith, hope, love. Love is the greatest thing in the world. Faith is the greatest power in the world. Hope is the most exalted beacon from the walls of the eternal city that ever waved its hand and said, "Come forward!" These three—faith, hope and love, are going to stay with us.

I will have utterly failed in this chapter if I have not sufficiently impressed upon the reader's mind the baptism of the Holy Spirit in its O. T. symbolism, the baptism of the Holy Spirit in its prophecies and promises, the baptism in fact, the baptism in its purpose, and then the temporary nature of the baptism because it was intended to be a sign.

QUESTIONS

1. What the sixth ecclesiastical disorder, and where do we find Paul's great discussion of it?
2. What text does the author use to express the central truth of this discussion, what is his preferred translation of it, and why?
3. What O. T. symbols foreshadow the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and what the correspondence between these symbols and the coming of the Spirit on Pentecost?
4. What the purpose of the baptism in the Spirit on Pentecost?
5. Where in the O. T. do we find the baptism of the Holy Spirit in prophecy?
6. What passages in the N. T. show the baptism in the Holy Spirit in promise?
7. What the contrasts of Matt. 3:11, 12, and what the distinction between baptism in water and baptism in Spirit (1) as to administrator, (2) as to element, and (3) as to purpose?

8. What the contrast between the statement of Jesus in John 7:37-39, and His previous statement to the Samaritan woman at the well, and what the object of the giving of the Spirit as referred to in this chapter?

9. What the distinction between baptism in the Holy Spirit and conversion (regeneration), (1) as to the agent, (2) as to the subject, (3) as to the object?

10. What the N. T. book of comfort, what the O. T. book of comfort, and why was each so called, respectively?

11. What the import of Luke 24:49, Acts 1:8 and Mark 16:17, 18?

12. What passages in the N. T. show the baptism of the Holy Spirit in fulfillment?

13. By what phenomena was the baptism of the Holy Spirit manifested on the day of Pentecost, and to what human sense did each appeal severally?

14. Show how they were baptized on the day of Pentecost *eis ten ecclesian.*

15. What the reason, especially for the baptism of the Holy Spirit in the case of the Samaritans?

16. Why the baptism of the Spirit at the house of Cornelius?

17. Why were the twelve baptized in the Holy Spirit at Ephesus?

18. Where do we find the most extended and elaborate discussion of the baptism in the Holy Spirit?

19. What called forth this discussion by Paul?

20. What the object of the baptism in the Holy Spirit as shown clearly in this discussion?

21. How did the baptism in the Holy Spirit accredit the church?

22. Were these displays of power the same in every person?

23. What were the diversities of gifts resulting from the baptism in the Holy Spirit?

24. Prove the temporary nature of the baptism in the Holy Spirit, and what do we really pray for if we pray for the baptism in the Holy Spirit?

25. What were the Corinthians really doing in their misuse and abuse of these gifts?

XX

LOVE, THE GREATEST THING IN THE WORLD

Scripture: I Cor. 13:1-13.

IN the judgment of the critical world I Cor. 13 is the most exquisite gem in all literature. Upon it the great scientist, Henry Drummond, has written his masterpiece, "The Greatest Thing in the World." Let us note very particularly that verse 31 of the preceding chapter is both introductory to chapter 13 and explanatory: "But desire earnestly the greater gifts. And moreover, a most excellent way show I unto you." There is a distinction in the gifts conferred in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. Some were greater than others, and one of the smallest of them in merit was the power to speak in other tongues, and that is the one they are making themselves fools over. He goes on to show, before he gets through with the discussion, that tongues do not edify, but prophecy does. So he says, "While these gifts are various, desire earnestly the greater gifts." Having shown that distinction between the gifts of the baptism of the Holy Spirit, some greater than others, and that they should desire the greater ones rather than the inferior ones, he then adds, "A most excellent way show I unto you," that is, something ahead of all the gifts received in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, something far superior to any conference of mere power upon man; so what he discusses now in chapter 13 is a more excellent way than the baptism in the Holy Spirit.

He gets at his thought this way: "If I speak with the tongues of men and of angels, but have not love, I am become sounding brass, or a clanging cymbal." Look at that thought. He is going to draw an eclectic man—a man who possesses the high excellence of all great men and leaves out their faults—for instance, the patience of Job, the patriotism of Washington, the wisdom of Solomon, the strength of Samson, the meekness of Moses, and so on. He is going to picture a man that has all the excellence of an earthly kind that any man ever had. "If I speak with the tongues of men"—that means all the tongues of men. If in the university or college one is proficient in Greek, Latin, Hebrew, Spanish, French and German, they call him a linguist and he becomes famous; but now add to those every other language ever spoken by man from the few gutturals of the lowest barbarian in Africa to the most cultured scholar in London or Paris; then add to that that he can speak in the language of angels; that he can think his thoughts into heaven and stop Gabriel and make him think his thoughts back to him, or Michael, or any other of the shining lights that stand in the presence of God—suppose he could do that, and he doesn't have what Paul is here presenting—love—he would, with all of those vociferous tongues, be as sounding brass or clanging cymbal. He is proving the superiority of the Christian graces—faith, hope and love—over anything that is involved in the gifts of the Holy Spirit. This is the "most excellent way." He goes on, "And if I have the gift of prophecy." That is another one of the gifts of the Holy Spirit.

Suppose God had gathered back the curtains from all the future to the great judgment day in my sight, so as to enable me to see it all, as a whole and every minute detail, the yet unrecorded things of the future; what if

my heart as a prophet was as hot as Jeremiah's; what if a live coal from the altar was put upon my lips as upon Isaiah's; what if I, like John on Patmos, could see high above the world the great court of God, then have it pass in review before me in grand panorama till Jesus comes; suppose I had that, as well as all those languages "and knew all mysteries," so that nature has no secrets from me; so that there is nothing in astronomy, in geology, in biology, in sociology, nothing in any of the "ologies" that I do not know; suppose that like Solomon, I could sing a song concerning the birds that fly through the air, the vine that grows on the wall, and the fish that swim in the sea; suppose I could be able to locate a gold mine, a coal mine, a deposit of oil, and every mine of precious jewels; suppose I could look to the bottom of the sea, and behold all the jewels and the money and the fine apparel that had ever been sunk into its depths; what if I understood eclipses, cyclones, earthquakes, all mysteries (That is the sort of man we are coming to, an eclectic man): "If I had all knowledge," not in one department, but in all departments, so that I myself was the biggest encyclopedia in the world; so that I myself was a walking library of all the records of history and achievements of science in any of its departments; so that whatever man has ever known since the world was, down to the present time, I knew; "and if I have all faith [not saving faith, but that faith that enables one to work miracles], so as to remove mountains"; if I could make Himalaya and the Ural change places; if I could pile the Alps upon the Apennines, and the Apennines upon the Pyrenees, as the old giants are said to have done Pelion on Ossa; if I could look at Ætna, Vesuvius, Hecla, Stromboli, and Popocatepetl and say, "Put out your fires," and they would become extinct

in a moment, and I have not love, I would just be nothing.

He wants to make clear the thought of the great difference between gifts and graces. Then he goes on, "And if I bestow all my goods to feed the poor." O what comments in the daily papers of the world that are excited by the huge gifts of the rich! Look at Carnegie trying to dispossess himself of all his wealth by building libraries over the world; look at Rockefeller giving $35,000,000.00 to one institution and $100,000,000.00 to the aggregate institutions. Now, what if I were to do that, and then, in addition to that, I were to give my body to be burned as an act of patriotism; to unselfishly be willing, not merely to die, but to be burned to death, in order to save other people from pain, and I had not love, I would be nothing. If the love that is set forth here did not prompt these things, then it is not as great a thing in the sight of God as one throb of real faith and real love in a converted Negro's heart.

In Shakespeare we have Mark Antony delivering the funeral oration over Cæsar. He had Cæsar's body brought before him, took the mantle off and showed the holes in it, and says, "I remember when he put this mantle on. It was the day that he conquered the Nervii." He holds in his hand Cæsar's will in which he gives all his goods to the Roman poor, (just what Paul is talking about) and the people are weeping while looking at the torn mantle, and the orator goes on, "Do you weep at merely seeing his garments rent? O, here is himself; here is Cæsar; look there; see where the envious Casca struck, and how his heart broke when Brutus smote him here." Cæsar, for motives governing his mind, did will all his goods to the Roman people. These people are accustomed to establish circuses, which they held in the

amphitheatre and let everybody come free to the big show in the circus, and the politicians that didn't give bread in the circuses didn't get a vote. A man might have the things that have made men famous in the past, every thing that I have enumerated, and when he dies gaping posterity would want the heavens to be hung with black, and the orators of the world to be praising him; the monuments would be erected higher than all earth's monuments up on top of each other, and all over each, and in large letters, would be inscribed the great attainments and achievements of this eclectic man, but if he were not God's child, if he didn't have faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, if he didn't have the love that is described here in this chapter, then we might let the monuments crumble into dust.

I never shall forget the enthusiasm of my heart when I read George W. Cutter's wonderful poetical paraphrase on Henry Clay's great oration at the foot of Bunker Hill monument. In that poem these words occur:

"There let it stand until the river that flows beneath shall cease to flow;
Until that hill itself shall quiver with nature's last convulsive throe,
And instead of a few inscriptions on it he would cover it all,
Until it should fail to furnish room to write even the initials of a man."

This is earthly fame.

Having shown that the excellencies of this world are nothing in comparison with the three things he is going to talk about, with a few strokes negative, and a few strokes positive, he describes love. Let us see what they are. We will take it negatively: "Love envieth not; love vaunteth not itself [doesn't brag], is not puffed up [doesn't swell up and become vain], doth not behave itself unseemly, seeketh not its own, is not provoked,

taketh not account of evil; rejoiceth not in unrighteousness." These are the negatives.

Let us see the positive side. This is what it does: "Love suffereth long and is kind; rejoiceth with the truth; beareth all things, believeth all things, hopeth all things, endureth all things. Love never faileth." That is love. He contrasts again. Let us see about these others—those given by the baptism in the Holy Spirit: "Whether there be tongues, they shall cease." They were given for a temporary purpose, for a sign, for attesting the church of the Lord Jesus Christ, and when that attestation is complete, tongues shall cease, and "whether there be knowledge, it shall be done away." Here he refers to the supernatural knowledge that comes with the baptism of the Holy Spirit. "For we know in part" in that baptism of the Holy Spirit that gives us such marvelous knowledge without study, and in order to get it we make no effort; it comes not by laborious, persistent reasoning and investigation, and yet he says, "When you have gotten it you know only in part, and when you have that marvelous gift of prophecy conferred upon you, you only prophesy in part; but when that which is perfect is come, that which is in part shall be done away. When I was a child, I spake as a child, I felt as a child, I thought as a child; now that I am become a man, I have put away childish things." In other words, "As a mere child, a novice, I might have been lifted up with the baptism of the Holy Spirit, as a little child rejoices to ride a corn-stalk horse." But when one becomes a man, he doesn't ride corn-stalk horses. Far, far removed, is any such thought. The perfection here is maturity. "I put away childish things," that is, the past is just as dust in the balance in comparison with other things, particularly, things he is going to discuss. "For now

we see in a mirror, darkly." The mirrors were not polished glass with a good background behind them, but just polished metal. Even the most finical belles of Rome when arraying themselves had to content themselves by standing before the mirror of polished metal, that would dimly reflect. I am sure it nearly killed them. "But then face to face." Love is going to put us where it will not be a reflection that we look at. We will stand face to face with the real thing. "Then shall I know fully, even as also I was fully known." Paul says, "Brethren, I count myself not to have apprehended, laid hold on, all the things for which Christ laid hold on me, but forgetting the things that are behind and reaching out for the things that are before, I press forward toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." Love will bring us there. Then he could see different things from what he could see by the gifts of the Holy Spirit. He says, "Here in Corinth, because my knowledge is so limited, I know only in part, but then I shall know even as I have been known."

> "O, would some pow'r the giftie gie us,
> To see ourselves as ithers see us!"

But better,

> "O would some power the gift to give us,
> To see ourselves as Jesus sees us!"

Not as Jesus sees us here, but as He sees us in the complete likeness; when our souls are as complete as His soul; when our bodies are as complete as His body; when our knowledge is as His knowledge. As a bolt of lightning lightens the landscape so that in one flash we may see every house, tree and building, so the knowledge in heaven will be by intuition that is swifter than any light-

ning on earth. The baptism in the Holy Spirit doesn't take us to that, but *love* will.

Then he goes on, "But now abideth faith, hope, love, these three; and the greatest of these is love." These are the abiding graces.

If just one spark of the divine love has ever shone in our souls—not if we have great faith in Jesus Christ, but if we have faith, great or little—if the love of God has ever been shed abroad in our hearts by the Holy Spirit which was given unto us, it will abide always within us, the Arminians to the contrary notwithstanding. It will abide, and adversity may come on us in its cruel image of death, and prosperity may attempt to beguile us, hell may send out demons like locusts from the pit to pluck us out of the hand of God, but faith, hope and love abide.

Then in view of this, methinks I hear him say, "Why then, O Corinthians, do you magnify the baptism of the Holy Spirit? Why have you discarded these, the most lasting, world-renewing and astounding graces of the Spirit, in order to fall down and worship mere power, whether it be power to move mountains or power to heal the sick, or whatever else?"

In closing this discussion, I will give a word-picture of three pyramids. We need to know what kind of love it is, for if we make a mistake on that, we have indeed made a great mistake. It is not a gushing thing, a sentimental thing, that people often talk about, who don't know anything about it. Imagine three blocks. On the first one put, "Faith." Then let us put a block on that a little shorter at each end and write, "Hope," then another on that block and write, "Love;" then on the top of that put a flag-staff and write on a banner, "I Cor. 13." Now what will that pyramid show? It will show that

love, the greatest thing in the world, is the topmost block; that it is bottomed on faith. So we have faith, hope, love. If a man says that he has the love that is spoken of in I Cor. 13 and has not faith, then his pyramid is an aircastle.

I will give another pyramid. This one commences at the top and starts with the banner. On it is written, "I Tim. 1: 5." Then on the first block under the banner-staff is written, "Love;" on the next which is a little longer, "out of a pure heart;" on the next block, "and a good conscience;" and the next block, "and faith unfeigned." There we have the base, that is, "faith unfeigned" leads to a "good conscience," then a "pure heart," and then to "love." A man's conscience is made good when it is purified by the blood of Jesus Christ: "How much more shall the blood of Christ, . . . cleanse your conscience, etc."

Now we come to the last pyramid, and we will let Peter build this one, either from the King James version or from the revised version. Peter says, "To a like precious faith add:" now put block one, and write, "Faith." Then on block two write, "virtue" (or courage; that is what it means,) and to virtue add knowledge; to knowledge, temperance; to temperance, patience; to patience, godliness; to godliness, brotherly kindness; to brotherly kindness, love. There love is on top and faith on the bottom again. Now draw on the pyramid the banner with II Peter 1: 5-7. When Paul discusses love he does not discuss the sentimental gush that anybody can talk about; he cannot conceive of this love that does not grow out of faith.

Does verse 12 prove heavenly recognition? It certainly does; as a good old sister said once, "I am not smart, never went to college, but I have always had

sense enough to recognize my friend here on earth, and I don't suppose I will be a bigger fool in heaven." Then we shall know even as we are known; we are recognized here, and it certainly teaches that we will be recognized there.

QUESTIONS

1. What the judgment of the critical world relative to I Cor. 13, and what the title of Henry Drummond's masterpiece written on it?
2. What the connection between 12:31 and chapter 13?
3. What the distinction in the gifts conferred in the baptism of the Holy Spirit, which the smallest perhaps, what exhortation concerning gifts, and what the "most excellent way" of 12:31?
4. With what does Paul contrast love, and what the author's eclectic man?
5. What the meaning of speaking with tongues, the gift of prophecy, the knowing of all mysteries, all knowledge, all faith, the bestowing of goods, and the giving of the body to be burned, as contrasted here by Paul?
6. What the description of love negatively?
7. What the description of love positively?
8. What contrasts does Paul now make as to the duration of these gifts?
9. What are three abiding graces, which is the greatest, and why?
10. Describe a pyramid based on I Cor. 13.
11. Describe one based on I Tim. 1:5.
12. Describe one based on II Peter 1:5-7.
13. Does the Bible teach heavenly recognition, and if so, what the proof?

XXI

THE GIFT OF TONGUES

Scripture: I Cor. 14:1-33

THIS discussion is devoted to I Cor. 14, and is the conclusion of the discussion of the miraculous spiritual gifts conferred in the baptism of the Holy Spirit. I will take all of the chapter down to verse 33. The rest of the chapter I reserve for a separate discussion. It is with reference to woman's place in the church, and I will combine that closing paragraph, touching the woman, with another paragraph in the same letter, and with a corresponding paragraph in the Letter of Timothy; and so we will just go to the 33rd verse inclusive:

"Follow after love." The word, "follow," has a strong meaning. It means to pursue, to chase, not just to saunter along after it, but to *pursue* it, to *chase* it; "yet desire earnestly spiritual gifts," that is to say, notwithstanding the comparison that he has instituted between faith, love and hope on the one hand, and the spiritual gifts on the other hand, he doesn't discount the spiritual gifts. "Earnestly desire them, but rather that ye may prophesy," that is, select that one as the one that is most profitable. Desire that one. To prophesy, in the Bible, does not necessarily mean to foretell future events. That may be included, but it means to speak for God under the inspiration of the Spirit, so that what one

says is as if God said it. Whether you are stating a fact or foretelling a future event, is immaterial. The meaning of the word "prophecy," is to speak for God under the impulse of God's Spirit. He goes on to explain why the gift of prophesying is superior to the gift of speaking in unknown tongues: "For he that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men, but unto God; for no man understandeth; but in the Spirit he speaketh mysteries." Mark that clause, "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh not unto men but unto God; for no man understandeth." Notice verse 4: "He that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself." Then verse 14: "For if I pray in a tongue, my spirit prayeth, but my understanding is unfruitful."

We have to combine those three passages: "He that speaketh in a tongue speaketh unto God; he that speaketh in a tongue edifieth himself; he that prayeth in a tongue his understanding is unfruitful." Those three expressions have given rise to a controversy that I suppose will not be settled until the judgment day. Upon them many distinguished scholars take the position that to speak in a tongue is to speak ecstatically; that the man himself is, in a measure, unconscious, as if some mighty power had seized upon him causing him to mutter and say things, and that when he comes from under the influence of that power he cannot recall what he said. Conybeare and Howson strongly present that argument. They say that to speak in unknown tongues is simply to speak ecstatically, as if in a trance. A person going under the influence of chloroform talks, but he doesn't remember what he says. Though that position is taken in the "Pulpit Commentary" and in Conybeare and Howson's book, the author utterly dissents from it. I do not like to put myself in antagonism with distinguished

men, but there are more distinguished men on my side than on the other side of the question.

Let me show that this speaking in tongues meant to speak in a language that a man had not acquired, and had not studied. Turn to Acts 2, where this gift is first manifested and commence at verse 6: "When this sound was heard, the multitude came together, and were confounded, because that every man heard them speaking in his own language. And they were all amazed and marveled, saying, Behold, are not all these that speak Galileans? And how hear we, every man in our own tongue wherein we were born? Parthians and Medes and Elamites, and the dwellers in Mesopotamia, and in Judea and Cappadocia, in Pontus and Asia, in Phrygia and Pamphylia, in Egypt and in the parts of Libya about Cyrene, and sojourners from Rome, both Jews and proselytes, Cretans and Arabians, we hear them speaking in our tongues the mighty works of God." A man must have more brass on his face than was ever in the brazen gates of Babylon to assume that that doesn't refer to speaking in different languages.

Here came a man from Cyrene over in Africa; there came a Roman; here a Cretan; there an Arabian; and they heard these men under the influence of the Holy Spirit speaking in the tongues in which they were born.

My second argument is based on I Cor. 14:14: "If I pray in a tongue . . . my understanding is unfruitful." I don't know what the words mean, but if it was an ecstasy that language would not be so applicable. I have no doubt that when God gave power to Balaam's beast to speak audibly, his language was not understood by him. He spoke in a language that he himself didn't understand.

Let us make a third argument. In olden times at the

Tower of Babel, where it is expressly said that the people were all of one lip, one speech, spoke the same language (and speaking the same tongue enabled them to hold together better, but they were holding together for evil) God came down and confused their speech, and a man up there putting down the sun-dried brick could not understand what the fellow with the hod said to him. It was in an unknown language. By the confounding of speech, nations arose.

The different languages didn't arise from the different nations, but different nations arose from different languages. The philological miracle around the Tower of Babel produced the different nations. Those that could understand each other would go together and they would become a nation, speaking one language of their own.

It was the intent that, as the human race was dispersed through the confusion of language, at Pentecost that should be reversed, and they should be brought together and united by giving the power to speak in the language of all the nations.

Take these three arguments and notice the objection that is made. The first objection is that he speaks to God, and no man understands him. Let us see how that applies. We will assume that we are present in that church at Corinth and one man, having the power to speak in different languages, speaks the Parthian tongue. Nobody understands him, for nobody speaks that tongue, and he can't understand himself, and he is, as it were, speaking unto God.

We can harmonize it with the theory that they were speaking different languages, but we cannot harmonize the effect by saying it was an ecstatic utterance like that given when under the influence of chloroform. However, I am not dogmatic as to this interpretation.

Let us advance again in the argument in this issue. Paul says, "If I speak in an unknown tongue which the people cannot understand, what good will it do unless I translate?" That shows that it was an unknown language. If we send a missionary to a foreign country and he does not know their speech and they don't know his speech, and a particular man knows both theirs and his, that man is asked to be an interpreter. The missionary says a few words, and then the interpreter speaks these words in the language of the people addressed. He understands. "Now," says Paul, "what good does it do to speak in unknown tongues unless you interpret?" He shows again that this is the thought. He says, "If you give thanks in an unknown tongue, how shall he that is unlearned say, 'amen,' to your giving thanks, since he does not understand what you say?" And how powerfully the reformers quoted that against the Roman Catholics whose public services were conducted in Latin whether anybody understood Latin or not. The reformers quote this passage and say, "How is that going to help the people? Speak it if you want to, but tell them what the Latin means."

I was making a reply once to a man who was going outside of the line in which he had knowledge, to criticise something that he knew nothing about. I pointed my finger at him and said, *"Ne sutor ultra crepidam."* I thought everybody would understand, but some fellow said, "Interpret." "Let not the shoemaker go beyond his last." "The shoemaker is a judge of the shape of the foot, but let him not criticise a painter's landscape," which became a parable. So you might say, "A mole is a good judge of earth-worms, but he is not expert on landscapes." Notice again that he says here, and the language is very remarkable in its bearing, "Even things

without life, giving a voice, whether pipe or harp, if they give not a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain voice, who shall prepare himself for war?"

I used to be a soldier, and every morning there was a certain bugle-sound called "reveille," which means, "Get up quick;" then a certain other sound of the trumpet meant, "Saddle up," and a certain other sound meant, "Mount," another very lively one meant, "Forward March." "Now," said Paul, "If a man just gets up and blows a noise out of a trumpet that doesn't signify anything, how can anybody prepare himself for battle?" Therefore he says, "I would rather speak five words to the church with my understanding than ten thousand words in an unknown tongue."

Some people like it because they think it sounds big. A politician said to General Jackson, "When you get up to make a speech throw in a little Latin." And so Jackson, at the close of the speech said, *"E Pluribus unum, ultima thule—ne plus ultra—potestatem dedit—ne sutor ultra crepidam, potens Cypri, Sic fratres Helenae, Sidera Lucida, Quamdem Catalina nostra patientia abutere?"* And the people just went wild in their cheering. Where it is just thrown in for the sound it has an exciting effect, but suppose we wanted to know what General Jackson was saying, what good would all that Latin do us if we did not know the Latin?

I leave it to you the reader as to whether I have made out my case, that the speaking with tongues means the speaking in languages that a man had not known, or that was unknown to him. If I spoke in Parthian and there was a Parthian present the Parthian could understand, but the Cretans and Arabians could not; if I were

saying good sense, in whatever language, God would understand. I would be speaking to God, and even if I couldn't understand, I could tell the mighty impulse of the Spirit. That would make me feel good, but it wouldn't edify other people.

This is a great chapter. We find in it something that ought to benefit us as long as we live. "Even things without life, giving a voice, whether pipe or harp, if they give not a distinction in the sounds, how shall it be known what is piped or harped? For if the trumpet give an uncertain sound who shall prepare himself for war? So also ye, unless ye utter by the tongue speech easy to be understood, how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye will speak into the air." There are, it may be, so many kinds of voices in the world, and no kind is without signification. No word is without some meaning, but if I don't know the meaning of the word I shall be "to him that speaketh a barbarian, and he that speaketh shall be a barbarian to me."

A critic who criticised everybody at a Baptist Convention, criticised my sermon by saying it had too many big words in it. I saw him when he made the note, and here are the words I used, stating the different places the people came from: "Oriental, occidental, austral, septentrional." I supposed that crowd of picked preachers would know the meaning of those words. I started out with "oriental," which means eastern; the occidental, that means the opposite from the eastern, or western; austral, that means southern, and septentrional, that meant northern. I wrote him that generally I tried to use words that anybody could understand, but occasionally I wanted to increase the vocabulary of the people that I spoke to.

If every man hears in his own tongue, he hears them

speak in the tongue that he was born in, not that they spoke Hebrew and the hearer heard it in Parthian. That would make the hearer the subject of the baptism; that would be putting the discriminating power to his ear. There were a great many speaking, one in Parthian, and another in Persian; one in Latin and another in Greek. Now all the Greek people would understand their own language because they were familiar with it. The hearers comprehended, though it was spoken in the language that the speaker knew nothing about.

Let us go on, taking up verse 15: "What is it then? I will pray with the Spirit, and I will pray with the understanding also. I will sing with the Spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also." In other words, a great deal of emphasis in religious matters must be put upon the understanding, and if the good pray, they want not only to be spiritually prompted to pray, but want to understand what they are praying about, and if I am praying in a language I don't know and know that somebody is listening, he may catch the spirit of the prayer, but it won't touch the spirit of his understanding. I want to hear the words.

One night at church the singing was just about as the seven stars above me. I was told by an expert that it was fine, but the screech in it didn't use any distinction in words. I couldn't tell what it was. If I had had a book before me I might have made out something of what they were trying to say.

When a man sings I want to hear the words. I don't want him just to sound his voice out in ascending and descending scales. They may be harmonious, but it isn't intelligible to me. I will put it plainer. When one goes to feed the cattle, he doesn't put the fodder so high that they can't reach it. It may be good fodder to look at,

but a cow would rather have it lower where she can reach it. That was the power of Christ's speech. He spoke words easily understood. He illustrated with a hen and chickens, a sparrow, the lilies of the field, the sheep, and the goat. The people could not find fault, because His words were simple and had meaning to them.

I remember when I was very small my father, who was a preacher, was sitting on the gallery and one of our smartest negroes, Aunt Sarah, came up and was telling about her new preacher. Father asked how she liked him. "O, he is fine." "What do you mean by fine?" "Well, he does speak such big sounding words." "What words did he use?" "Well, I remember the word 'fecundity'." "Well," father asked, "do you know what that means?" "O no, and I don't care whether I does or not; it's a mighty big word and it just thrilled me." Her understanding was not profited at all. That cow couldn't reach the fodder.

I am going to give another proof of the correctness of the position that I took on these languages: "In the law it is written, By men of strange tongues and by the lips of strangers will I speak unto this people." Where do we find that in the law? It is in Deuteronomy 28, and we find one very much like it in Isaiah 28, and that is this: "You get drunk, you men that represent God, and you say words that convey no meaning. Now because you have dishonored your power, I will speak to you in the language of a foreign nation, and you won't understand this language, and thus bring against you the Assyrian and the Babylonian." I have said that these baptismal gifts were for attesting, accrediting, and this proves it: "Wherefore tongues are for a sign, not to them that believe, but to the unbelieving." A sign is a

miracle intended to accredit the one speaking as having power and authority. That day at Jerusalem when that big crowd of many nations came together, these men that could speak only one language, were heard—these ignorant and unlearned men that had never been to school—speaking in the different languages of the world. "Some great power is here," they said. "It is a sign to you unbelievers, but prophesying is for a sign, not to the unbeliever, but unto them that believe." Suppose I am a believer and we stand upon the same plane, and all at once some mighty power descends on me, and I get up with a new spirit and speak with all the authority of God. That carries conviction to the soul of the believer. It is a sign to him that God's Spirit is on me.

We come now to the strongest part of the chapter, and one that I have preached many sermons on. I preached a sermon on it in Kansas City and S. J. Porter, now at San Antonio, was pastor of the church. When I got through with that sermon there was a stir in the congregation equal to Pentecost. I never saw such a sight in my life. My theme was, "How the Church Shall Convict Sinners of Sin." It reads as follows: "If therefore the whole church be assembled together and all speak with tongues [every one speaking in a different language], and there come in men unlearned or unbelieving, will they not say ye are mad [*i. e.*, you are crazy?] But if all prophesy, and there come in one unbelieving or unlearned, he is reproved by all, he is judged by all; the secrets of his heart are made manifest [that is, to him] and so he will fall down on his face and worship God, declaring that God is among you indeed."

I started out on this line: Where the congregation of God's people assemble there will likely step in some

ignorant man or some skeptic, and one of two things is going to happen—either they will convict that man of sin or he will convict them of sin. If the character of the services is such that they seem to be mere fanaticism or a sanctified row, one man praying while another is singing, and another is talking, and everything is confusion, all jumbled up, will he not say that they are crazy? And when he goes away he will carry the report about them, and his report is, "those so-called Christian people are simply mad; it is a delusion." Suppose, on the other hand, that when that ignorant man takes his seat and all of the services are so simple that notwithstanding his ignorance he can understand; the words are easy to be understood; he gets hold of the preaching or singing or praying, he is convicted by all. Convicting power rests upon the whole congregation, and that man sees the sins of his heart.

The secrets of his heart are manifest, and so falling down on his face he will worship God, and go away and report that God is with that crowd of people. Then how careful we ought to be at church to ask the question, "Is there any ignorant soul here today that I can so put the truth before that even his simple mind can see it? Is there not some skeptic here to-day who, by the order, instructiveness, the fervor, and the pathos of the service, may see himself to be a sinner in the sight of God?"

I have seen all of this. I have seen my old church in Waco when convicting power rested on every member of the congregation. There was something in each song, in each prayer, in each exposition of the Word of God, and in each word based on the exposition that went right home to a man's heart like a feathered arrow from the bow, and it got to be the talk of the town that no infidel could attend three of these services and not be converted.

One of them accepted the challenge, and I saw him when he came in the church. I was about a third of the way through my sermon. Conviction seized him, and before he got half-way down the aisle he was converted. He came right up to the front, whirled around and related his Christian experience, and I just let him do the talking. That was such fine preaching I just stopped.

I am now going to give out a secret. When Moses came down from the mountain where he had been communing with God, "Moses wist not that his face was shining," *i. e.,* Moses didn't know it was shining.

When one becomes conscious that he is shining, he quits shining. The most effective conviction of sinners ever wrought has been wrought by people that didn't know they were doing it.

The first time I was ever convicted of sin, the one that convicted me of sin had no idea of it. I had run away from home to go to a big barbecue and political speaking, and I was only thirteen years old, and I started home through a big pine forest, and when those pine trees began to moan at night and it got dark, it was not very comforting to a run-away boy. In the heart of the pine forest I saw a light. It was the light of a camp-meeting, in a big shed, with platforms erected, dirt piled up on the platforms and pine knots laid on the dirt; that illuminated the shed and all around it, and illuminated it well, too; not like electric lights perhaps, but very well. When I got in about one hundred yards of the meeting I heard somebody singing; evidently it was a woman, a sad woman, but yet a Christian woman, and as she kept up that song, so full of tears, I was convicted of sin from the crown of my head to the soles of my feet. The secrets of my heart were made manifest to me. When I got up closer, there she sat on the outside of that con-

gregation holding her dead baby in her lap. It had just died, and her heart was broken, but her Christian soul surrendered the baby to the Lord and submitted to His will, and she had commenced singing, "O love divine, all love excelling," and that song convicted me of sin. She didn't know that she was convicting me of sin. If she had been an actress and had tried to sing like a woman whose baby was dead, there would have been no power in it to convict.

I will name three books that I studied on the conviction of sinners of sin. They have never ceased to benefit me. The first book is the Bible. I commenced at Genesis and read straight through until I found a case of conviction of sin, and so I wrote that case down, *i. e.*, who was convicted of sin here, and how this conviction was brought about. For instance, the case of Joseph's brothers. When the cup was found in Benjamin's sack their guilty consciences said to them that their sin had found them out: "We are every one guilty concerning our brother's blood." Then I came to David. He had murdered Uriah, having debauched his wife, and had no compunctions of conscience, going to the temple and singing praises to Jehovah with them, and occupying the chief seats among the saints. After a while he was convicted of sin. Nathan comes to him and tells him a story about a man that had one ewe lamb, and it was all that he had, and a rich man had a large flock, and a traveler came to stay with the rich man, and he spared his flock, but took by violence the one ewe lamb of the poor man. David listened to the story and just got madder and madder, and finally cried out, "Whoever has done this shall die!" Nathan said, "Thou art the man!" David says, "I have sinned." He was convicted. And what took place on the day of Pentecost when they

were preaching to them was conviction. Then at another time the jailer says, "What must I do to be saved?" Thus I went through the Bible and made a study of it.

Then the next book that I took was my own experience. I went back over my life just as far as I could remember, and just as honestly as I could; I recalled every time in my life that I became sensible that I was a sinner and I asked myself, "What brought it about?"

And the third book that I read was the book of observation. One day a Mr. Sherwook preached a sermon in a big meeting in Georgia, and 4,000 grown men and women were converted. I never studied anything as I studied these three books—the Bible cases on conviction of sin, the cases of my own experience of conviction of sin, and the great historic cases of conviction of sin. That is the subject I discussed in Kansas City. The message was that God had appointed the church to convict sinners and lead them to salvation.

Paul now says, "How is it that every one hath a psalm, everyone a hymn?" In other words, "When you get together each man is so anxious to parade what he knows that one talks Greek, another talks Parthian; this one preaches, that one prays; another is singing, and the services are a confusion. God is not here. You will make a wrong impression by a service of that kind." Some call that a "sanctified row" if they want to. It is in reality a row without the "sanctified." The most powerful conviction comes in a still meeting, where one can hear a pin drop. The sinner's conviction is signal, as if in a great electric storm the lightning had struck and riven hundreds of trees and they are falling right and left, and yet no voice is lifted—not a whisper. It is the stillness of profound attention and emotion.

The point is that God intended the gifts in the baptism

of the Spirit for a certain purpose, and these Corinthians were using them for other purposes, and they were doing harm rather than good. They had lost sight of their mission to convict sinners and lead them to Christ. Ignorant people came, and went away uninstructed; skeptics came, and went away confirmed in their skepticism; they went away and reported that there was nothing in that crowd; that if that was religion they didn't want to see any more of it. Maybe the preacher was conceited as to his part and would use the biggest words that he could, until they would think he was some great one, and when the choir would sing they would screech and get as far away from singing a song that one could understand as possible; everything perfunctory, but God was not in the songs, nor in the prayers, nor in the sermon, and the day was lost, and souls were lost.

QUESTIONS

1. Why did the author omit the latter part of chapter 14 for the time being?
2. What does "Follow after love," 14:1, mean, and what Paul's application here?
3. What the most profitable gift of the Spirit, and what is meant by prophesying?
4. Why is the gift of prophesying superior to the gift of tongues?
5. What three passages furnish the basis of the teaching by some that to speak in a tongue means to speak ecstatically, and where may the argument be found?
6. What the author's first argument to show that to speak in a tongue meant to speak a language one had never learned?
7. What his second argument?
8. What his third argument?
9. What the first objection to this argument, and the reply?
10. How does Paul show further that the author's interpretation is correct?
11. What text used especially by the reformers and how?
12. What illustration from the author's experience?
13. How does Paul illustrate the thought, and what the author's parallel illustration from his war-experience?

14. What illustration of the effect of big sounding words on a popular audience given by the author?
15. Was the speaker or the hearer the subject of the baptism in Holy Spirit? Illustrate.
16. What statement here shows Paul's emphasis on the "understanding" in religious matters, and what the application to modern singing? Illustrate.
17. What the author's proof of the correctness of his position from the references to the law and to prophecy?
18. What the direct proof that tongues were to attest? Illustrate.
19. What text here shows how a church may convict a sinner?
20. What illustration of this from the author's life?
21. What the author's secret respecting Moses, and the present-day application of it? Illustrate.
22. What three books given by the author on the conviction of sin, and how did he study them?
23. What the condition where there is the greatest convicting power?
24. What the main point of all this discussion by Paul, and the application by the author?

XXII

MARRIAGE, DIVORCE, AND THE POSITION OF WOMEN IN PUBLIC ASSEMBLIES

Scriptures: I Cor. 7:1-40; 11:2-16; 14:33-40

IT will be recalled that we have been treating I Corinthians topically, and hence when we take hold of a subject we take in everything bearing on that subject and pass over some things. Heretofore we have left untouched the whole of the chapter 7, 11:2-16 and the chapter 14 from 33 to the end. So that the scope of the present discussion is the three passages—all of chapter 7; 11:2-16, and 14:33 to the end. The general topics embraced in these parts of the first letter are Marriage, Divorce, and the Position of Women in the Public Assemblies, all exceedingly delicate questions, and therefore my reserve in treating the matter. I don't suppose there is much help in studying this letter in the commentaries. I myself had never reached a very satisfactory conclusion on some points involved until recently.

Before we take up the serious matter of marriage, divorce and the whole question of sexual relation, there are certain antecedent matters to consider, and the first is, that whatever is here said by the Apostle Paul is an answer to a letter that the Corinthian church wrote him. He commences chapter 7 with a reference to that letter. He says, "Now concerning the things whereof ye wrote."

So we see that he answers questions propounded to him. The next antecedent thing is that we must never forget the mixed, ethnic composition of this church. "Ethnic" means "of many nationalities." The mixed, ethnic composition of this church and the particular distressed conditions existing at the time that he wrote, are matters of great importance. This church was composed of Greeks, Romans and other Orientals, besides Jews.

Upon the subject of marriage, divorce and the position of women, the Jews, Romans and Greeks widely differed. Each nation had its own fixed custom or customs upon all of these points, and they were all converted in this big meeting, some from all these peoples. And they naturally wanted to know what was the bearing of the new religion upon this subject of marriage, divorce, and the position of women, slavery and things of that kind.

Among the Jews divorce was granted for a very slight cause. Moses did permit divorce in this form, viz.: that no man could put away his wife without giving her a bill of divorcement; he could not put her away and leave her as goods and chattels that he was not responsible for. He must give her a bill showing that he claimed nothing from her in the future. Christ explained, that on account of the hardness of their hearts, divorce was allowed by Moses, who did ameliorate it, but didn't give the highest law on divorce, because they were not in condition to hear it. Following that custom, Josephus tells us frankly that he put away his wife because she didn't please him, and he assigned no other reason, and went before no court. It would be very hard to please some men, even some of the time, and very hard to please them all the time; and it wouldn't be best to please them all the time, for much of the time they would be wrong. Among the Greeks and Romans divorce could be had

for almost any reason. Moreover, the Orientals believed in the seclusion of women. They kept them in harems guarded by a eunuch; but the Romans had much broader views than the Greeks, and the Greeks were much in advance of the Orientals. A lady at Rome had great liberty without being subjected to invidious criticisms. This is the mixed ethnic condition of this church.

But another thing must be considered which is expressed in chapter 7. Paul says, "I think therefore that this is good by reason of the distress that is upon us." There was a particular distress bearing upon the people at that time that modified the answers that he gave to some of their questions, and we can't understand this chapter 7 and the other paragraphs in chapters 11 and 14 without keeping in mind that broad statement—"the distress that is upon us." That refers to the condition of the church at that time when all Christians were persecuted. No Christian knew one day what would be his financial status the next, for everything of his might be confiscated. He could not know one day whether he would be out of prison the next; he couldn't know one day whether he would be banished the next. Day by day they were practically taking their lives in their own hands. If a man is living in a prosperous time it wouldn't be proper to answer him on the question of marriage as if he were living in unsettled conditions. In other words, what would be expedient in prosperous times, would be inexpedient in unprosperous times.

The third important antecedent thought in the understanding of those passages is the people's misconception of the results of regeneration. Paul had said to them, "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature: the old things are passed away; behold they are become new." They did not know how far to carry this thought. For

instance, if a married man was not converted yesterday, but became a convert today, did his marriage pass away? I will show how that this is a very practical question before we get through with this discussion. A man was a slave yesterday and unconverted; he hears the gospel of freedom preached to him, that is, that if the Son makes him free he is free indeed. He hears that in Christ Jesus there is neither bond nor free, therefore today he, being a new creature, what conclusion shall he draw from this new relation as to his slavery?

Again, the gospel was preached to them as individuals, without regard to age, sex or previous condition of servitude, and it was distinctly stated that in Christ Jesus there is neither male nor female, Barbarian, Scythian, bond, free, Jew nor Gentile. If that be true, has not every Christian precisely the same privileges in the public assembly, whether man or woman? If there be neither male nor female in Christ Jesus, may not a woman preach as well as a man? If they stand on the same footing when they join the church, what effect does it have on the old commandment that a child should obey his parents, or that the wife is subject to her husband? It may seem that this is all a little overstrained, but the history of the world shows that these are intensely important questions.

Take the case of the "mad men of Munster," who argued from the fact that Jesus had come to establish a kingdom upon the earth, and that that kingdom was to overcome all other kingdoms of the earth. They said, "Therefore, if I be a member of the kingdom of Jesus, that absolves me from my allegiance to any kingdom of this earth." There were no subordinates in the land where they lived, as they were free from the law of the nation. They reasoned that if they had the liberty of

a Christian, might they not take two or three wives? Hence the leader of the Munsterites did not stop until he got fourteen, but that was not quite so far as Brigham Young went. They went on, "Do we, being the children of Jesus Christ, have to pay tribute or taxes? If I be a member of the kingdom of Jesus Christ that absolves me from any kingdom of this earth, why not set up a purely religious kingdom?" One of these men was made king, and the whole power of the German empire had to be invoked to put down this movement. Yet a great many people were converted people—enthusiasts misconstruing the teaching of God upon the results that would follow our becoming new creatures.

Yet again, this gospel taught that the citizenship of a Christian is up yonder, not down here, and that up yonder neither marrying nor giving in marriage takes place. Upon this they reasoned thus: "Does not that obligate me to lay down the work of this world? Why talk about farming, merchandising, and the dull, heavy round of earthly occupations?" Just so the Thessalonians went wild, because they expected Christ to come "day-after-tomorrow," and therefore there could be nothing for them to do except prepare their ascension robes. In other words, "Up there they don't marry, and what effect does that have on me, since I am married? I have become a citizen of heaven, where they do not marry. Ought I not to abjure this marriage? Ought I not to go and live in a monastery and leave my wife and children on the care of the world? If I have never married, should I not become a sister, and enter into the nunnery?" Such were their reasonings.

The last great things that we are to consider in chapter 7 is the point that we have just presented: "If I contracted marriage before I was converted, was it

dissolved when I became a new creature, and old things passed away? If I have not contracted a marriage, shall I avoid it?" The apostle answers it, first, from the viewpoint of the *present* distress that he refers to, *i. e.*, in view of the *present* condition, when their property might be swept away in a day, when they must be silent or be in banishment. He takes the position that in this particular stress and under these conditions it was well not to marry. But we must not forget the old-time law that God instituted marriage as the only way to carry out the commandment of God to multiply and replenish the earth. Therefore, Paul says, "My advice to you is to let every man have his own wife, and every woman her own husband." It was impossible for him to take a position against the necessity of marriage, but he said that in view of that distress it might be best not to marry, but if they did marry notwithstanding the distress, they committed no sin, and if governed by the distress not to marry this was no sin, but as long as we are in this world and the sexual distinction exists, we cannot get away from that primeval law of God that marriage is honorable in all.

We know that another question was presented because of the answer given. Suppose one is already married when converted? In the middle ages this question became one of the biggest that ever occupied man's mind. It was a common thing for a man at his conversion to say, "In view of the fact that I am now under a higher law of God, I will give up my wife and children, go from home and shut myself up in a monastery." Hundreds and thousands of men and women took the vow never to marry. There are many cases where the men took the vows of celibacy, trying to live a life like the angels. That is the most seductive form of tempta-

tion that ever came to men, and it led to the building of monasteries and nunneries all over Europe and a greater part of Asia and North Africa, where women would seclude themselves and vow not to marry, and even married men would abandon wives and children and shut themselves up in monasteries. Paul says, "If a man is married let him not put away his wife, and let not the woman put away her husband. Your being converted does not change the law of God in regard to marriage." So the question comes in another and different form. Under the old law of the Jews, a Jew could not marry a heathen, unless a proselyte, without the penalty of excommunication, and the ground was, that to marry a heathen puts him in danger of becoming an idolater. In Nehemiah we learn that when some of the Jews had violated that law, he put before them the alternative of either keeping the Jewish law or being excluded from the Jewish communion. Knowing what the law was on that subject, they put the question, "Here is a man who is converted and his wife is a heathen; shall the Christian put away his heathen wife?" That is very different from the original question, "Ought a Christian to marry a heathen?" which law holds now that it is best for believers to marry believers, but Paul answers that question emphatically, "No; the marriage relation is a divine institution and there is nothing in such a case to justify that man to put away his wife."

Then the question comes in another form: "Suppose when a woman joins the church that the heathen husband makes it a ground of disfellowship and refuses to live with her, what then?" Paul said, "In such a case, if the unbeliever depart, let him depart. You have done nothing wrong and are willing to stand to your marriage contract." But what does he mean by saying, "The

husband or wife is not in bondage in such a case?" Does it mean that a voluntary separation totally abrogates the marriage tie so that the one left is at liberty to marry somebody else? That question comes up in our own civil law. Blackstone comments on it, saying, "You may grant divorce *'A mensa et thora,'* " which means, "Divorce from bed and board." In other words, people can separate; the man doesn't have to live with that woman, and the woman doesn't have to live with that man. But the law is emphatic that such separation is not breaking the marriage bond. It permits a possible separation. That is intensely practicable.

When I was a young preacher I was called into a council. A preacher's wife had left him. She refused to live with him, left him, and went back to her father, and he afterwards married again, and his plea was that abandonment justified remarriage. He quoted that passage, "A husband and wife are not in bondage in such cases." The question for that council to decide was, "Would it be a wise thing to put a man into the ministry who lived under a cloud of that kind?" One of the oldest and most distinguished Baptists that ever lived took the position that such a one was free to marry again, but I, a young preacher, dissented from him, and do still. It does not break the marriage tie so as to permit one to marry again. I quoted the declaration of Paul where he says, "The wife is bound by the law as long as her husband lives," and he certainly couldn't contradict himself in the same chapter. Then he says, "If her husband be dead, she shall be permitted to marry again." That settles that question.

Paul does not discuss the only cause that does thoroughly break the marriage bond, if one is disposed to plead it, which is the case of infidelity to the marriage

vow discussed by our Lord. Hence my contention is that what is here said does not discuss all of the law on the subject of marriage and divorce.

Let us take up the question, "Ought widowers and widows to remarry?" There he states that a widower under the law of Christ may marry again, though it is not mandatory. There was at one time the question raised of putting a special tax on bachelors. The Greeks and Romans had a law to that effect. It is nothing to smile at; it comes from the idea that the state is more important than the individual. They carried that law further, and forbade a bachelor to inherit; if he remained unmarried he must turn over his property to the state.

When I was a little boy we had a kangaroo court, and a candidate for the legislature was telling what he would do if he were elected. He said, "I would change the pronoun 'them' for the word 'um,' so all the common people could say grammatically, 'I love um,' and I would have a law passed that would draw a tooth from an old bachelor's head for every year he remained unmarried."

But how does Paul answer that question. He says, "If you take this present distress into consideration, it is not favorable for contracting marriage. If you want to marry, do so, but you will have trouble in view of this distress." But he says that it is lawful for a widow to marry again, and in the case of young widows, as in the Letter to Timothy, he makes it a very urgent recommendation.

Let us take the next question: Does regeneration change the natural subordination of woman to the man, and the sphere in which each moves? The gospel preached was that in Christ Jesus there was neither male nor female. So in chapter 11 he answers, "I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ;

and the head of the woman is the man. * * * Every man praying or prophesying, having his head covered, dishonoreth his head. But every woman praying or prophesying with her head unveiled, dishonoreth her head; it is one and the same thing as if she were shaven [that was a sign of an infamous life]. * * * But if it is a shame to a woman to be shorn or shaven, let her be veiled. For a man indeed ought not to have his head veiled, forasmuch as he is the image and glory of God; but the woman is the glory of man. For the man is not of the woman; but the woman of the man: for neither was the man created for the woman; but the woman for the man." The angels of God were hovering round watching over the assemblies of God's people, and it grieved them to see the law of God violated. Paul goes on; he is not only arguing from that old law, but he is arguing from nature: "Is it seemly that a woman pray unto God unveiled? Doth not even nature itself teach you, that if a man have long hair, it is a dishonor to him?" I once knew a young fellow who was really pretty. He had great long curls that he spent a long time each day in combing and twisting and anointing with oil, and brushing. And I took the N. T., marked this passage, and sent it to him. It made him very indignant.

Paul's answer is that becoming a new creature, so that "old things are passed away and all things become new," does not mean that all old things, viz.: that God's law of order has passed away. When we get to heaven we will live as the angels live, but while we live on earth the laws of order instituted in Paradise must stand.

That question comes up in a little different form in chapter 14: "God is not a God of confusion, but of peace. As in all the churches of the saints, let the women keep silence in the churches: for it is not permitted unto

them to speak; but let them be in subjection, as also sayeth the law. And if they would learn anything, let them ask their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the church." Now they are meeting that by saying that the Word of God had come to women. And it is unquestionable that the spirit of prophecy did come to women. But Paul teaches that that spirit of prophecy was subject to the person that had it; that it was not given him to violate order; and that if the spirit of prophecy did come to them, let them remember that it came to other people also.

North of the Mason and Dixon's line we occasionally come upon a church with a woman for a pastor—a Baptist church at that. I was both cheered and hissed for a statement I made when I preached in Chicago. I don't know which was the louder, the cheering or the hissing. I started out expounding this passage of scripture, I Timothy 2: "I desire therefore that the men pray in every place, lifting up holy hands, without wrath and disputing. In like manner that the women adorn themselves in modest apparel, with shamefacedness and sobriety; not with braided hair, and gold or pearls or costly raiment; but (which becometh women professing godliness) through good works. Let a woman learn in quietness with all subjection. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to have dominion over man, but to be in quietness. For Adam was first formed, then Eve." Adam saw Eve and said, "Issha," woman; it means that woman is derived from man; that she got her soul and her body from Adam. She is as much a descendant of Adam as we are. I read the scripture, and took the position that there are two distinct spheres, the man's sphere and the woman's sphere; that the man's is more public; that the woman shall live in her children. When

a worldly woman came to visit Cornelia and paraded her fine jewels that blazed on her head and arms and her ankles before her, Cornelia, drawing forward her two sons, Gaius and Tiberius Gracchus (the Gracchi), said, "These are my jewels, and I am going to live in these. My sphere is my home and my boys."

There is one other question—that of the slave. They said, "If I am a freedman of Christ, shall I be a slave to man?" But Paul answers that Christianity does not propose to unsettle the established order of things. Its object is to develop the inner life: "Let each one of you abide in the law you were in when God called you." In other words, if he was circumcised, let him not try to efface his circumcision. If he was a slave when God called him, let him be satisfied with being Christ's freedman, and with knowing that his master is Christ's servant, and let him in his position of slavery illustrate that the truth and the power of the Christian religion is in serving, not with eye service, but showing that Christianity can come to any form of life and glorify it. In yet other words, being converted and becoming a new creature, we should not disregard the established order of things which God has appointed for this world. When we get up into the other world we can adapt ourselves to conditions there.

QUESTIONS

1. What the scope of this chapter, and what the several topics?
2. What is the first important antecedent matter in chapter 7?
3. What the second antecedent matter, and of whom was the church at Corinth composed?
4. What the position of Jews, Romans and Greeks, respectively, on marriage and divorce, and the woman-question in general?
5. What the difference between the Orientals, on the one hand, and the Greeks and Romans, on the other hand, with respect to this question?

6. What condition at the time Paul wrote this letter greatly modified his answers to some of their questions?
7. What the third antecedent thought essential to an understanding of these scriptures?
8. How did their application of this thought affect their earthly relations? Illustrate fully.
9. What was Paul's answer to their inquiry as to whether one who was not married should marry, and what its bearing on the primal law of marriage?
10. What question arose about those who were converted after marriage, what Paul's answer to it, and what the results of this misconception of the Corinthians as practiced in the Middle Ages?
11. Ought a Christian to marry an unbeliever?
12. What is the Christian wife or husband to do in case the unregenerated husband or wife makes it a ground of disfellowship, and refuses to live in the marriage relation?
13. What does Paul mean by saying, "The husband or wife is not in bondage in such a case?"
14. What illustration of the author's interpretation from his own experience?
15. What the only cause which breaks the marriage bond, and where do we find the statement of it?
16. What the law of marriage in the case of widowers and widows, and what legislation against bachelors?
17. What the bearing of this subject on the relation between man and woman in the sphere in which each moves, what Paul's teaching on this, and what his arguments for it?
18. What the form of this question as treated in chapter 14, how do some people meet Paul's argument here, and what does Paul teach that settles the question beyond all dispute?
19. What the author's experience on this line in Chicago, and what is his interpretation of I Tim. 2:8-15? Illustrate.
20. How did this subject affect the relation of the slave and his master, and what Paul's answer to their reasoning on the subject?

XXIII

THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

Scriptures: All References

THE fifteenth chapter of I Corinthians is a great chapter on the resurrection of the dead. Luther said that the doctrine of justification by faith was the doctrine of the standing or falling church, but inasmuch as Christ was raised for our justification, we would be nearer the truth to say that the doctrine of the standing or falling church is the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. I understand by the resurrection of the dead the making alive of a dead body, raising it from the grave, and glorifying it—that is, what was sown in weakness is raised in strength; what was sown in dishonor is raised in honor; what was sown in corruption is raised in incorruption; what was sown a mortal body is raised an immortal body; what was sown a natural body is raised a spiritual body, and then a reunion of the body with the soul which once inhabited it. That is my understanding of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead, and it certainly includes the idea of the identity of the body.

Before leading on to Paul's argument I will show the importance of the subject under consideration, and the first point that I make is that our Lord Jesus Christ in His lifetime made this the crucial proof or demonstration of His divinity and of His mission. He made this issue

with His enemies. I cite therefore the following passages upon that point. I will prove that intelligently and openly this was made the keynote position with His enemies and understood by them. In John 2:19 (Harmony, p. 20) the Jews who were indignant at His first purgation of the temple, demanded of Him: "What sign showest thou unto us, seeing thou doest these things? Jesus answered and said unto them, Destroy this temple, and in three days I will raise it up. The Jews therefore said, forty and six years was this temple in building, and wilt thou raise it up in three days? But He spake of the temple of His body. When therefore He was raised from the dead, His disciples remembered that He spake this; and they believed the scripture, and the word which Jesus had said."

Again, Matt. 12:38 (Harmony, p. 59): "Then certain of the scribes and Pharisees answered Him, saying, Master, we would see a sign from thee. But He answered and said unto them, An evil and adulterous generation seeketh after a sign; and there shall be no sign given to it but the sign of Jonah the prophet: for as Jonah was three days and three nights in the belly of the whale; so shall the Son of Man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth. The men of Nineveh shall stand up in the judgment with this generation, and shall condemn it: for they repented at the preaching of Jonah; and behold, a greater than Jonah is here. The queen of the south shall rise up in the judgment with this generation [showing that the resurrection is to be general] and condemn it: for she came from the ends of the earth to hear the wisdom of Solomon; and behold, a greater than Solomon is here." Those were there who repented and those who were impenitent.

But the point I am now on is that the issue was joined.

Let us see that they distinctly understood the issue. Matt. 27:39, 40, while He was hanging upon the cross "they that passed by railed on Him, wagging their heads, and saying, 'Thou that destroyeth the temple, and buildest it in three days, save thyself; if thou art the Son of God, come down from the cross." Then in the same chapter again, after He was buried (page 217, Harmony), "The chief priests and the Pharisees were gathered together unto Pilate, saying, "Sir, we remember that that deceiver said, while He was yet alive, after three days I will rise again. Command therefore that the sepulchre be made sure until the third day, lest haply His disciples come and steal Him away, and say unto the people, He is risen from the dead: and the last error will be worse than the first. Pilate said unto them, Ye have a guard; go your way, make it as sure as ye can. So they went, and made the sepulchre sure, sealing the stone, the guard being with them."

Now look at the report of that guard: "Now while they were going, behold, some of the guard came into the city, and told unto the chief priests all the things that had come to pass. And when they were assembled with the elders and had taken counsel, they gave large money unto the soldiers, saying, Say ye, His disciples came by night, and stole Him away while we slept. And if this come to the governor's ears, we will persuade him, and rid you of care. So they took the money, and did as they were taught; and this saying was spread abroad among the Jews, *and continueth* until this day."—Matt. 28:11-15, Harmony, page 222.

As final proof on that issue, the issue being His resurrection from the dead, I cite Acts 4, on the occasion of Peter and John healing the impotent man: "And it came to pass on the morrow, that their rulers and elders and

scribes were gathered together in Jerusalem; and Annas the high priest was there, and Caiaphas, and John, and Alexander, and as many as were of the kindred of the high priest. And when they set them in the midst, they inquired, By what power, or in what name, have you done this? Then Peter, filled with the Holy Spirit, said unto them, Ye rulers of the people, and elders, if we this day are examined concerning a good deed done to an impotent man, by what means this man is made whole; be it known unto you all, and to all the people of Israel, that in the name of Jesus Christ of Nazareth, whom ye crucified, whom God raised from the dead, even in Him doth this man stand here before you whole. He is the stone which is set at nought of you the builders, which was made the head of the corner. And in none other is there salvation: for neither is there any other name under heaven, that is given among men, wherein we must be saved." This shows that it was still the issue after His resurrection from the dead. There was a challenge given, and a challenge accepted, and the matter was put to proof.

Just as clearly, on this very doctrine, is His teaching to His disciples. On the occasion of the great confession of Peter, this is what occurred (Harmony, page 91): "From that time began Jesus to show unto His disciples, how that He must go unto Jerusalem, and suffer many things of the chief priests and scribes, and be killed, and on the third day be raised up." Peter rebuked Him. He had not understood the death of Christ, nor the resurrection of Christ. The disciples were very slow to believe, but He began the teaching of that doctrine at Cæsarea Philippi, where that disciple said, "Thou art the Son of the living God." Notice again in Galilee, the last six months of His ministry, this language is used

(Matt. 17, Harmony, p. 97): "Jesus said unto them, The Son of Man shall be delivered up into the hands of men; and they shall kill Him, and the third day He shall be raised up. And they were exceeding sorry." Or as Mark says, "They understood not the saying." Or as Luke puts it, "Let these words sink in to your ears," and then he adds, "They understood not the saying, and it was concealed from them, that they should not perceive it," and Mark says, "And were afraid to ask Him." This is the chronological order of the teaching.

In John 10, after this incident that I have just cited, Jesus says, "I lay down my life, that I may take it up again. No one taketh it away from me, but I lay it down of myself. I have power to lay it down, and I have power to take it up again. This commandment received I from my Father." Yet they do not seem to realize.

I cite a still later incident. This is when He was on His way to Jerusalem for the last time. It is recorded in Matt. 20, Mark 10, Luke 18: "Behold, we go up to Jerusalem; and the Son of Man shall be delivered unto the chief priests and scribes; and they shall condemn Him to death, and shall deliver Him unto the Gentiles to mock, and to scourge, and to crucify; and on the third day He shall be raised up."

I cite a still later instance that is recorded after His resurrection. On one of His appearances to them He brings this matter up and impresses it with great emphasis upon their hearts. He appeared unto them and "they were terrified and affrighted, and supposed that they beheld a spirit. And He upbraided them with their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not them which had seen Him after He was risen. And He said unto them, Why are ye troubled? and wherefore do

reasonings arise in your heart? See my hands and my feet, that it is I myself; handle me and see; for a spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye behold me having. And when He had said this, He showed them His hands and His feet. And while they still disbelieved for joy, and wondered, He said unto them, Have ye here anything to eat? And they gave Him a piece of broiled fish. And He took it, and did eat before them," Harmony, p. 225. And later He invited Thomas to put his finger in the prints of the nails and in His side. Therefore the Apostle John in his letter uses this language: "That which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled—declare we unto you."

In 1907 there was a minister of the South of exceeding loose views on the inspiration of the scriptures, and, it seemed to me, in order to give him the opportunity to exploit his particular views, they put him up to preach a sermon at the Southern Baptist Convention, and in that sermon he used these words (I shall never forget them): "Christ's resurrection-body was assumed temporarily, merely for the purpose of identification, and afterwards eliminated. What became of it we don't know, and it is not important that we should know." Those are his very words. The sermon was published.

In a textbook of the Southern Baptist Theological Seminary at Louisville, "Epochs in the Life of Jesus," by Dr. Robertson (an exceedingly valuable book with this one blur on it), there is this statement: "All at once Jesus stood in the midst of them; He had risen from the dead. This appearance opposes the idea that it was only the spirit of Jesus. He showed His hands and His side and expressly alleged that He was not a mere spirit, but even had flesh and bones. [Now we

come to the trouble.] This passage adds to the difficulty. One must admit it, for flesh and bones will not enter into heaven. In the resurrection the body is a spiritual body; but one must remember that the case of Jesus is entirely exceptional. He spent forty days where His body was in sight. He could go through closed doors and yet eat broiled fish." That is where the man got his idea in the sermon.

I was appointed to preach the next year, and I preached on the "Nature and Person of Our Lord." In that sermon I used these words:

"He is the first-born from the dead. That means He was the first in history whose body was raised to die no more. Other resurrections of both Testaments were but resuscitations to mortal life.

"It means that the same body that died on the cross was the body raised from the tomb, and was so identified, unmistakably. It means far more: That this very body which was dead, quickened, raised, recognized, was the body in which He ascended into heaven, and which is now in heaven, and in which He will return to His people. To say that Christ's risen body was assumed merely for the purpose of identification is the rankest heresy. To break any link in the chain of its identity is to destroy all of the doctrine of the resurrection and blot out all hope for the revival of our own dead. He was declared to be the Son of God by His resurrection from the dead. It is the keystone of the arch of redemption. It is just as important for us to know what became of the body of Jesus as it is to know that He was raised from the dead.

"God's history of the divine man, Christ Jesus, is not a mutilated fragment. Christ's body ascended into the clouds with the angelic assurance—the assurance that

'This same Jesus (identity again) shall come in like manner as ye beheld Him going into heaven.' And this ascending Jesus was the very one who had just for forty days 'showed himself alive after His passion by many infallible proofs.' So John says, 'That which was in the beginning, that we beheld, which our hands have handled,' etc. Who, because of metaphysical difficulties interpreted into Christ's words and deeds, from these difficulties evolved from his own puzzled questionings, shall dare to break the identity of the body of the resurrection of the ascending Jesus?"

I call attention again to this fact—that Jesus said that when He got to the place to which He was going, the Holy Spirit would come, and He came down on the day of Pentecost as the demonstration that Jesus of Nazareth that was crucified and buried, that was raised, and, as Paul says, that was exalted, is yet alive, and so John, in Revelation, says, "He is risen," and he hears Him say, showing it is the same person, "I am He that was dead, that am alive to die no more," and being alive He can now give proof of His life, and does give it every day that we live. Then He gave the ordinance of baptism as a monumental evidence, and He pledged that the day upon which He arose would become to the Christian the Sabbath of the New Covenant. As long as waters form into lakes or are gathered into baptistries; as long as men celebrate the Lord's supper that points to His second advent; as long as congregations assemble upon the first day of the week to worship, these things will stand as pledges to the fact of the resurrection of the dead.

Let us take up Paul. Attention has already been called to the mixed character of the constituency of the church at Corinth. There were Jews, and other Orientals,

and Romans and Greeks, and all these people had different philosophies concerning the future life and the disposition of the body. Three of these philosophies are worth mentioning here. First, the Greek-Epicurean, whose views were shared by the Sadducees, who were materialistic and atheistic, denying that there is any such thing as spirit, or that there is any resurrection of the body. Second, the Stoic philosophy. Their philosophy was that the soul exists, but ultimately it will be absorbed and left in the divinity which created it. They did not believe in the resurrection of the body in any sense. The third view was that of Plato. He believed in the immortality of the soul; he did not believe that the soul would ever be merged into the divine being so as to lose its identity, but he did not believe in the future life the body. Plato's philosophy was that in dying one gets rid of sin; that sin resides in the body, and to die is to be saved, if he gets rid of the body.

I present these views in order that we may understand the significance of the address of Paul to the people who may have held one or another of these philosophies, or the subsequent ones developed soon after, and in order to show that as these views are held now, chapter 15 is just as important to us as it was to them to whom it was addressed.

QUESTIONS

1. What chapter is perhaps the greatest chapter in the Bible on the resurrection of the dead?
2. What said Luther of the doctrine of justification, and what doctrine, according to the author, more nearly expresses the truth?
3. What is meant by the resurrection of the dead, and what does it especially include?
4. How does the author show the importance of the resurrection, what the first point, and what the scripture proof?
5. Cite three scriptures showing that Christ made His resur-

rection the test of His divinity with His enemies, and three others showing that He made the same test with His disciples.

6. Cite proof that His enemies understood and accepted the challenge, and also proof that the disciples did not understand His test until after His resurrection.

7. What the proof that this was still the issue after His resurrection?

8. On what historic occasion did a preacher exploit his views on this subject, what were his views, and how were they met by the author?

9. What the position of the author on this question, and what importance does he attach to it?

10. How was the exaltation of the risen Lord demonstrated, and what the testimony of Paul and John to the fact that He is alive?

11. What the monumental evidence of His resurrection?

12. What the Epicurean philosophy concerning the future life and the disposition of the body?

13. What the Stoic philosophy on the same points?

14. What the Platonian philosophy concerning the same points?

15. Why is it necessary to understand these views before studying I Cor. 15?

XXIV

DEATH, AND THE RESURRECTION OF THE DEAD

Scripture: I Cor. 15:1-58

THIS chapter commences with the statement of the facts which constitute the gospel. The first fact, "Christ died for our sins, according to the scriptures." Three ideas are involved in that fact:

1. Christ actually died. It was not a mere trance; it was actual death.

2. It was a vicarious, substitutionary, expiatory death. "He died for our sins."

3. He died for our sins "according to the scriptures" —that the scriptures of the O. T. and N. T. up to the time of His crucifixion clearly foretold His actual, substitutionary and expiatory death.

The second fact in the gospel is that He was buried— He was dead and buried—and that was according to the scriptures. The scriptures testified that He would be buried. The third fact is that on the third day, according to the scriptures, He rose from the dead; and the fourth fact of the gospel is, that risen, He was visible to men, recognized by men, and identified by men.

Paul goes on to tell of the numerous appearances, including an appearance to him. He was buried, He rose again, He was visible after death with spiritual evidence, and His body was identified. In other words,

John says, as if to anticipate many foolish statements, "We don't know what we shall be, but we do know that when He comes we shall be like Him, for we shall see Him as He is."

The next thing that Paul presents is that this was not merely a preaching of his, but all the apostles preached it, as verse 11 of that chapter shows. And the next thought is that they did not originate it. He says, "I have delivered unto you that which I also received, and you received it from me." That was according to the sign which Christ submitted: "He died, He was buried and was raised." The next argument that he makes is that every Christian in the days of the apostles believed what he said, "As I delivered it, so you received it, and that so believing it, you are saved by it," making it a doctrine of salvation.

He then passes to this position—that the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is the foundation of all Christianity. He presents it under the following heads: (1) "If there be no such thing as a resurrection of the dead, why, then, Christ is not risen. (2) Then all preaching is vain. (3) All faith in the preaching is vain. (4) All of the apostles were false witnesses, for every one of them testified that Christ rose from the dead, and that they saw Him. (5) He then says again, "If there be no resurrection of the dead, you are yet in your sins," *i. e.*, when they said that God for Christ's sake forgave their sins, they either wilfully lied or were deluded. It was not a fact. He adds next, "Those without hope of the resurrection are of all men the most miserable." That is a tremendous thing. If this hope be taken away the Christian is the most miserable of all men.

He then shows the place of this resurrection of Jesus

Christ in the scheme of redemption, and in their order are these: (1) Christ is risen from the dead, the first-fruits of them that are asleep. No man had been raised from the dead in the same sense, that is, to die no more. Two men had been translated, Enoch and Elijah, and after His own resurrection many of the saints came out of their tombs and appeared unto many people who were able to recognize them. It was true that Lazarus was raised, but he was raised to die again.

Next he shows that this position results from Christ's position as a Second Adam, and hence ours. As by the first Adam death came, so by the Second Adam the resurrection comes, and that means not only the resurrection of the righteous, but the wicked. In two places in the scriptures, and very emphatically in one of them, the words indicating universality are used. But all in their body are quickened, further indicating his position in the scheme of redemption. He says that the resurrection of Christ must not only precede all others, but draw the others after it as a result. Then he proceeds to show that the resurrection is necessary to the raising of Christ and the exercise of His high priestly functions in heaven, as is further developed in the Letter to the Philippians. He emptied himself, laid aside all His glory, and became obedient unto death, therefore God hath also highly exalted Him, in His exaltation to be King of kings and Lord of lords, and to exercise the functions of His high priesthood. They were based upon the fact that He had died and was raised.

He goes on further to show this by stating that Christ's reign on the mediatorial throne in heaven is to last until every enemy that shall be destroyed is dead. Then Christ delivers up His kingdom to His Father; so if we deny the resurrection from the dead, we deny that

Christ is Priest and King. Not only that, we deny this: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand [that is, in the kingly position], until I make thine enemies thy footstool." We not only deny that, but we deny all assurance that there will be a judgment day. Paul testified that God hath appointed a day in which He will judge the world, and hath given assurance to all men in that He hath raised Him from the dead. So the resurrection of the dead underlies the doctrine of the judgment.

He then takes up the life of a Christian. The first argument that he presents is this: "Else what shall they do that are baptized for the dead? If the dead are not raised at all, why then are they baptized for them?" Doubtless the reader is asking in his mind, "What does that mean?" I will give some theories that I don't believe, and then I will give what I think it means.

The first theory is that Christians had already commenced proxy baptism; that if a man unfortunately died before he was baptized, some friend would be baptized for him. I have two reasons for regarding that as false. First, there is not any reason to believe that any had done this before the writing of the scriptures; second, that if it had been much practiced the Apostle Paul never could have quoted it with any degree of approval. So I am quite sure it doesn't mean that.

The second explanation is that the baptism for the dead refers to the baptism of suffering. Christ says, "I have a baptism to be baptized with," and He tells His disciples that they must be baptized with the same baptism, but there is no reference to those who undergo this baptism of suffering here.

Here is what I think it does mean: "As many of you as were baptized into Christ were baptized unto His

death," *i. e.*, "You made the profession of faith that you were dead to sin, and being dead to sin you are symbolically buried and raised to walk in the newness of life." In other words, to put it in plain English, it means this, Why retain the ordinance of baptism if there be no resurrection from the dead? That is what it means. What signification has it? It is a baptism unto Christ's death. What should they do who are baptized for the dead if the dead rise not at all? What is the use of the ordinance?

The next argument that Paul presents is based on the life of Christians and their endurance of suffering. He says, "Why should I have fought with wild beasts at Ephesus, and placed my life in jeopardy every hour, if there be no resurrection from the dead?" He had been sentenced to death—was delivered up to death, and the sentence of death was wrought. In other words, I believe that what is there stated is not even mentioned in the Acts. The wild beasts of Ephesus were not the crowd that was raised by the silversmith, for they didn't get to Paul at all. He was not even present, but it means that he was condemned to death—that he was thrown into the amphitheatre and, as he says, God raised him up. Now, what is the pertinency to the matter in hand? Why was a Christian thrown to the wild beasts, and why, being thrown to those beasts, did he not rather deny his Savior and purchase his life? It is said in the Letter to the Hebrews that the O. T. saints who believed in Jehovah, *e. g.*, women refused to receive their children, looking for a better resurrection, not the escape from death in a figure, as Isaac escaped in the case of Abraham, but they willingly saw their loved ones die, because they believed in a better resurrection than a mere pardon after the sentence of death had been pronounced.

I have a copy of a great painting which I always keep in my study to show my children. Every one of them has stood before that picture and heard its explanation. It presents a Christian girl betrothed to a heathen lover. Her father and mother are heathen. This girl, becoming a Christian, was brought before the image of Diana and commanded to take just a little incense and sprinkle it on the image, and that would save her. There is her lover begging her not to lose him forever. There are the old father and mother weeping and saying, "O daughter, don't break our hearts!" There she stands with her face lifted up to heaven, pledging not to abjure the name of her Lord. That shows what a tremendous power that doctrine was in the life and death of the saints of God.

I shall never forget this incident: One day after great solemnity of feeling I went down to the Brazos River with an omnibus full of ladies clothed in white, and buried them in baptism. I came out and said to the driver, "Take me to the cemetery while my dripping clothes are on me; I want to stand over the little enclosure that holds three of my children buried there where we put them," and standing there with tears rolling down my face, I said, "Little ones, you shall not sleep forever; your father this day has erected a monument that pledges your resurrection from the dead. I will see you again; we will meet each other, and we will never part again." I have passed through many precious experiences of the Christian religion, but none more calm or sweet than that one.

His third argument from the life of the Christian is based on the quotation from the heathen poet, "Evil companionships corrupt good morals," not *manners,* but *morals.* His thought is, to deny the resurrection from

the dead corrupts morals—that morality is all dependent upon antecedent doctrines from which it is developed. Therefore Paul's letters all commence with doctrines, and when he has gotten through with them he takes up morals as developed from them. Then he quotes the doctrine of the Epicureans: "If the dead are not raised, let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we die." Or as a Latin proverb of the Epicureans puts it, *Carpe dies,* "Seize the day," that is, the joys of the present. A notable French infidel was dying, and a friend said, "Do you want to see a priest?" "O, no!" "Do you regret anything?" He said, "Why should I? I have never denied myself anything that I wanted." He was perfectly satisfied. That was his theory of life, but that theory would destroy the significance of all holy relations between father and daughter, husband and wife, and the soul and God—would destroy all altruistic doctrines. Miss Rose Cleveland took the position that George Eliot could not write poetry; that she could write in the form of poetry, but it was simply prose arranged in that way. Big ideas in it, but no poetic soul in it, and she said that no agnostic could write poetry. I thought it was the best criticism that I ever saw on the emptiness of infidelity. It knows nothing of the great position from which the imagination flies up to its God and catches inspiration from the heavenly Muses.

We now come, in his discussion, to the process of the resurrection, and the kind of body with which it is raised. This is another argument where Paul is replying to an objection: Some one will say, "How are the dead raised?" He first starts out with an analogy. It creates presumptive proof. He says, "When you go out into a field to sow, you sow wheat or barley or grain, and it produces grain of its kind." A grain of wheat was

found when they discovered and brought over to this country a mummy of that old Pharaoh that persecuted the Jews, and they got the grain of wheat. It had been preserved alive in the hand of that mummy for ages, and did no good until discovery brough it to light and it was planted. It died—then it produced abundant wheat. Paul says, "Think on that analogy of nature." Then he proceeds to explain the different kinds of flesh. He says that the flesh of a beast is not the flesh of a bird or a fish. The beast has a body that is adapted to the surroundings, as the bird to the atmosphere. When we pass to the heavenly environment, why should not our bodies be changed to suit new conditions, as there are bodies terrestrial and bodies celestial? He then takes up the heavenly bodies and calls attention to the fact that the splendor and the glory of the sun and the moon and the stars are different, as everything has a form to suit its condition. That is his analogical argument. As Oliver Wendell Holmes says, "Who has not gone out whistling and musing, busy with his thoughts, and as it were by chance, turned over a piece of bark and beheld the mysterious things under there, and seen how they ran to cover themselves? One of them may be an ugly thing that cannot get away, but when it passes through death, from the chrysalis emerges the golden winged butterfly that in the air finds its home." Paul does not attempt to explain, therefore he presents these illustrations, and no man ever can explain life of any kind. We can not, to save our lives, explain how in an acorn there is a giant oak. He then tells what there is in every resurrection of the dead. First, there is a quickening of the body that was put in the grave; second, the raising of that body; third, the glorifying of that body. Every one of those things is involved in the resurrection of a

righteous man. As every man is born in the image of the first Adam, they shall be in the image of the Second Adam.

As he proceeds to illustrate still further, he takes the case where there never has been and never will be any death at all. Enoch never died, Elijah never died, and nobody ever questioned the identity of their bodies. There was a transformation that glorified those bodies without dying, and then, as if leaning over and whispering a great secret, he says, "Behold, I tell you a mystery: Not all people shall die; some shall be alive when Jesus comes, and when He comes the living shall be like Enoch and Elijah," referring to the living Christians. He then adds what so many preachers misinterpret. It is this: "O death, where is thy victory?" In other words, "You never got to me." That is at the second coming of Christ. "O spirit world, where is thy victory?" They never were disembodied.

Now comes a great part, and in a few words. The second result of the resurrection is that the Christian's labor is not in vain: "Wherefore, my beloved brethren, be ye steadfast, unmovable, always abounding in the work of the Lord." If there be no resurrection from the dead, every preacher's labor is vain; if there be a resurrection of the dead there shall be fulfilled the declaration of Psalm 126: "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy, and he that goeth forth weeping, bearing precious seed, shall doubtless come again with rejoicing bringing his sheaves with him." Or as is expressed in Galatians: "Let us not be weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not." See the bearing of the passage in I Corinthians, where he makes this astounding statement: "God giveth us the victory in every place," then he tells how their preaching was the

savor of life unto life or of death unto death, and in either event God is glorified, and that it was his duty to present God's gospel, even if he knew it would be rejected.

I close by quoting that great author and man, Fairbairn: "If Christ be not risen then that tomb of Joseph is not only a tomb of a man, but of a religion." Christ made the issue of death and the resurrection. To His enemies Christ gave the sign, "As Jonah was three days and three nights in the great fish," etc. They said, "Sir, we remember that He said that the third day He would rise, and then the last error is worse than the first one, *i. e.*, we are in a worse fix than if we had never killed Him." In revivals of religion, the afflatus comes upon men in the Spirit of God. All utterances and liberty in speech, in speaking, explain that Jesus who was dead, is alive again.

QUESTIONS

1. How does Paul introduce the subject of the resurrection in this 15th chapter of I Corinthians?
2. What does he claim as to the origin of his gospel, and how did they treat it when he preached it to them?
3. What is the first fact of the gospel, and what three ideas involved in this fact?
4. What the second fact of the gospel?
5. What the third fact of the gospel, and what its relation to the O. T. scriptures?
6. What the fourth fact of the gospel, and what is involved in this fact?
7. How does John seem to anticipate many foolish speculations?
8. Was this merely a preaching of Paul's, or was it the preaching of the Twelve, and what the proof?
9. How does Paul, under seven heads, show that the resurrection is the foundation of Christianity?
10. What the place of Christ's resurrection in the scheme of redemption, and what is the meaning of "the first-fruits of them that are asleep?" Illustrate.
11. What the argument from the two Adams as to Christ's position, and how does he here prove the universality of the resurrection?

12. How does he show the necessity of Christ's resurrection in order to the exercise of His high priestly functions, and what parallel passage in another letter?

13. What is involved in a denial of the resurrection from the dead?

14. What the meaning of "baptized for the dead," what the several theories relative to it, and what the arguments against these theories?

15. What argument does Paul make for the resurrection, based upon the life of Christians and their endurance of suffering, and what the author's interpretation of "fought with wild beasts at Ephesus?"

16. Describe the scene in the picture referred to, and give the author's experience illustrating the tremendous power which the doctrine of the resurrection has over the lives of God's saints.

17. What his argument for the resurrection based on a quotation from a heathen poet, who the poet, what the doctrine of the Epicureans, what the Latin proverb equivalent, and what illustrations cited?

18. What the process of the resurrection, and how does he show the kind of body with which a person is raised?

19. What mystery does Paul here give, what its interpretation, and when will this be fulfilled?

20. What the inference and practical application of verse 58?

21. In conclusion, what quotation given, what its meaning, and what the perpetual evidence of Christ's resurrection?

XXV

THE GREAT COLLECTION, MANY ADVERSARIES, INFERIOR, BUT WORTHY BRETHREN, HOUSEHOLD CHURCHES AND ANATHEMA MARANA THA

Scripture: I Cor. 16:1-24.

THIS chapter closes up our discussion on I Corinthians. There are at least five important lessons to be learned in this last chapter.

1. *The Great Collection.* (16:1-4). Every Bible student ought to know the history of the series of collections, of which this one is a part. Participating in it are all the churches in Galatia, the churches in Macedonia, and the churches of Achaia, of which Corinth was the capital. It is quite probable that more sections of territory participated in it than these, but these three are specified. It is a collection, taken, not by one church only, nor by the churches of one province only, nor even the churches of one continent only, but Asia united with Europe in one big collection. It is every way a big lesson. The extent of territory covered, the long period of time in which the campaign was prosecuted, the number of churches participating, the great principles underlying their co-operation in one great financial and benevolent enterprise, the number and character of the leaders who engineered its details, the wisdom of the methods employed, not only in the taking of each collection, but

in its transportation and final disbursements, the lessons incidentally suggested, the laying down of great fundamental principles susceptible of fair application to other kingdom-enterprises, the motives to which appeals were made, the great direct object to be attained, and the mightier reflex influences put in motion—all these, and others not now cited, call upon us to give the lesson deep and sustained attention.

It is not purposed now, however, to do more than prepare for the thorough study requisite, which will come up more appropriately in II Corinthians, where we will find, not just four verses, as here, but two whole chapters devoted to the subject. Now the reader is directed to study carefully and in their order the following heads:

I. The poor saints in Jerusalem for whom these collections on two continents were taken.

II. The occasion and necessity for so many and so great collections in their behalf. On this necessity will be found these scriptures having an indirect bearing, to-wit: Acts 2:44, 45, 4:32-37, 5:1-11, 6:1-4. Then it will be found that Acts 11:27-30 has a more direct bearing. And still more direct, Gal. 2:1-10, especially verse 10, coinciding in time and place with Acts 15:1-6.

III. The absolutely direct scriptures on the history of these collections are: I Cor. 16:1-4; II Cor., all of chapters 8 and 9, and 12:17, 18; Romans, 15:25-28; Acts 24:17.

The reader must make his own independent study of all these scriptures; and I would suggest that he read chapter 32 of Farrar's "Life of Paul," and the corresponding part of Conybeare and Howson's "Life and Epistles of Paul." Having carefully made this prelim-

inary study, then he is prepared to answer particularly the following questions and others that may follow:

1. What was the ground of obligation resting on the Gentile churches to make this contribution?

2. Who were Paul's coadjutors in engineering it?

3. What were the rules governing this collection, or what the great motives to which appeals were made?

4. What the steps taken to guard against misapprehension concerning the handling of money?

5. What the application of principles involved to other kingdom-enterprises?

6. Finally, what the varied results of the entire campaign?

That is the first great lesson on chapter 16.

II. *The Second Lesson* is based upon verses 7, 8 and 9: "For I do not wish to see you now by the way; for I hope to tarry a while with you, if the Lord permit. But I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost; for a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries."

The Corinthians were urging him to vist them, and he assigned reasons why he could not visit them just at that time. He was engaged in a great meeting at Ephesus which had been prolonged for years, and in which all proconsular Asia received the gospel, hence he says, "I will tarry at Ephesus until Pentecost; for a great door and effectual is opened unto me, and there are many adversaries." This is one of the greatest preaching themes in the Bible. The imagination must see the great effectual door wide open, the adversaries trying to shut the door, the Corinthian people trying to call the apostle away from the door, and his purpose to stand there and preach as long as God holds that door open.

Upon that theme one may note: First, what the door is, and second, who it is that opens it. In this connection consider the following passages: Rev. 3:7, 8. This tells us who it is that opens the door; II Cor. 2:12; Col. 4:3, which shows what is the door to be opened on the preacher's part; Acts 14:27; 16:14, which shows the door to be opened on the people's part. Considering the adversaries who were trying to shut the door, we have recourse to the history of his work at Ephesus as set forth in Acts 19. By reference to that chapter we may find the following to be the list of the obstacles, or adversaries, in Paul's way at Ephesus:

1. Disciples baptized without authority, that is, by an unlawful administrator, verses 1-7.

2. The opposition of the synagogue, verse 9.

3. The opposition of the evil spirits, verses 11 and 12.

4. The opposition of exorcists, that is, impostors who claimed to have the power to cast out evil spirits.

5. The opposition of evil deeds, verse 19.

6. The opposition of evil literature, or magical books, verse 19.

7. The opposition of evil business, verse 24.

8. The opposition of the craftsman's ring, verses 25, 26.

9. The opposition of the pride and the commercial spirit of the city, verse 27.

10. The opposition of a howling mob, verses 28, 29.

Many times in Texas have I preached upon this great theme, showing the doors that are locked and the great door-opener, the adversaries who try to shut the door, and the power of the gospel over the adversaries. This is the second great lesson in chapter 16.

III. *The Third Lesson* is the deference to be paid to inferior, but worthy brethren—16:10, 11, 15-18. It

is characteristic of the churches that they want the greatest men to preach to them, and a great man can not be at every place. The apostle is telling them how they must treat Timothy, who is young, timid and shy. Oftentimes I receive letters from churches saying, "Come yourself; don't send some of your young theologs to practice on us." Paul is showing that no matter how young one is, how inferior in experience and attainments to others, if, like Stephanas, he is devoting himself to ministering to the saints, and, like Timothy, he is trying to do good, the churches ought to honor such men, and feel proud to do it. The world needs a lesson right on that point.

IV. *The Fourth Lesson,* 16:19, shows household-churches, or churches accustomed to meet in the house of a certain wealthy brother. The three other passages are Romans 16:5, Col. 4:15, and Philemon 2. A study of these four scriptures shows that in addition to the principal church in a place, as at Rome, Corinth, Colosse, there were smaller churches meeting in private houses. As yet they had no public buildings as we have. Indeed, we have to come down to the second century before we find meeting houses built especially for the purpose, but a small church did meet in the house of Aquila and Priscilla, another in the house of Philemon and another in the house of Nymphas.

My object in calling attention to these four scriptures is to show that they destroy the very prevalent modern contention, which I am sorry to see advocated by some people of the South, that in the days of the apostles every Christian in the city, no matter how large the city and numerous the Christians, was included in the church, and the head preacher was a bishop over the other preachers, who preached to different parts of this one

church. Some very distinguished Baptists are now advocating that view in the South. From this error arose later the idea of a metropolitan bishop, and later a diocesan bishop.

V. *The Fifth and Last Lesson* of this chapter is found in verses 21, 22, as follows: "The salutation of me, Paul, with mine own hand. If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be Anathema, Marana tha." As has already been explained, Paul was accustomed to dictate his letters, and with only one exception, the letter to the Galatians, after dictating the letter he would sign it himself. But this touches the words, "Anathema, Marana tha." What do they mean?

When I was a schoolboy at Independence, at a session of the Baptist Convention, the pastor of the First Baptist Church at Waco, a fine, portly man, preached a sermon before the State Convention on this text: "If any man loveth not the Lord, let him be Anathema, Marana tha." He had a rich, sonorous voice like that of Spurgeon or Richard Fuller, and as he rolled out the words of this text it seemed like a mighty big text. Assuming a dramatic attitude, he commenced his sermon in exactly these words: "When the flaming sword of divine justice was flashing in the sunbeam of heaven and whistling in its rapid path to sever the soul of man, Jesus stepped out and bared His own bosom and let the fiery sword be sheathed in His heart; therefore, if any man love not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be Anathema, Marana tha." With some preachers the sound of the text is its chief attraction. "Anathema" is a Greek word meaning let him be accursed. "Marana tha" is the kind of Hebrew that the Jews spoke at the time of Christ, that is, the Aramaic, or Syriac. While the first word expressed the curse, the second word tells when

the curse will come. "Marana tha" means *"the coming."* In plain English, "If any man loveth not the Lord Jesus Christ, let him be accursed when Christ shall come." The same idea is found in Matt. 25, where the curse is pronounced upon those that did not love Christ: "Depart ye accursed into everlasting fire prepared for the devil and his angels, and these go away unto eternal punishment." Or the words of II Thess. 1:7-10: "At the revelation of the Lord Jesus from heaven with the angels of His power in flaming fire, rendering vengeance to them that know not God, and to them that obey not the gospel of our Lord Jesus: who shall suffer punishment, even eternal destruction from the face of the Lord and from the glory of His might, when He shall come to be glorified in His saints."

QUESTIONS

1. What the first lesson of chapter 16, and what the scripture?
2. What makes this lesson so very important?
3. Where do we find this subject elaborated?
4. Under what three heads is the reader directed to study this collection?
5. What scriptures cited on each of the last two heads, and what books commended on these scriptures?
6. What six questions constitute a kind of outline for the study of this collection?
7. What the second lesson, and what the scripture?
8. What were the conditions which occasioned this language of Paul?
9. What points may be noted concerning the door referred to, and what the scriptures cited?
10. What were the ten adversaries in Paul's way at Ephesus?
11. What the third lesson of this chapter, and what the scripture?
12. How does the author show the need of this great lesson in modern times?
13. What the fourth lesson and the scripture?
14. What three other passages bearing on the subject, and what modern teaching to the contrary?
15. What the fifth lesson and the scripture?
16. What the meaning of "Anathema Marana tha?" Illustrate.
17. What other scriptures teach the same thought?

THE BOOK OF SECOND CORINTHIANS

XXVI

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION AND EXPOSITION

Scriptures: All References and II Cor. 1:1-20

THE second letter to the Corinthians grows out of the first and its development. Paul wrote it. We know that the first letter was written at Ephesus just before Pentecost, in the spring. This letter was written soon afterwards, probably in the summer, A. D. 57.

Acts 19:21, 22 tells us how he left Ephesus, where he wrote the first letter; also, Acts 20:1. In this letter, 7:5-13, after leaving Ephesus he came to Troas, the site of ancient Troy, whence he set out to establish the gospel in Europe on a previous expedition. At Troas he had appointed a rendezvous with Titus, who took the first letter to Corinth. He told Titus to meet him at Troas and report about the reception of that letter. When he got to Troas our letter tells us that he was distressed in mind about not meeting Titus and hearing the effect of his first letter—so distressed that he could not work, though a great door was opened to him. So he left Troas and crossed over into Macedonia. This letter tells us that in Macedonia, not specifying where, Titus came to him with the report of the reception of the first letter.

On the reception of that report he wrote this second letter and sent it back by Titus. So his letter grows out of the report of Titus. In studying its parts we can easily find out what the report was, and thereby get the key to the occasion of the letter.

Titus reports first, that when he got to Corinth the other letter was well received, but that they received him in fear and trembling. We find that statement in 7:15. He states, in the second place, that the majority of the church were deeply penitent over the wrongs that had provoked the first letter, particularly with reference to this case of fornication in the church. When we study the character of that repentance we find one of the best lessons on repentance to be found in the Word of God. He then states that under this penitence the church excluded the erring man, and that the erring man himself was made penitent by the action of the church and Paul's letter. He then tells Paul that he had commenced to take the collection for which he had been sent, and that it was progressing very well, though not completed yet. All that was very satisfactory and lifted a great burden off Paul's heart.

But Titus brought a mixed report. Some of it was bad. He reported that some members of the church were unequally yoked with unbelievers, who by their association with heathen in the festivals and games disqualified themselves for the true Christian life.

A very distinguished Alabama lady wrote me once about dancing and said, "I found that, while it seemed to be innocent *per se,* its spirit was such that it became a foe to grace in my heart." She was a rich woman belonging to the better class of the old-time Southern people. Some of her kinsfolk were members of my church, which brought about the correspondence. The

letter showed how very difficult it is for one in social life to keep from doing many things hurtful to Christian character and influence. So this report from Titus showed that many Corinthians had crippled their influence by social entanglements.

His report further showed that while the minority of the church accepted and acted upon Paul's letter, yet the spirit of debate, strife, envy and jealousy was rife. Thirty-five years after Paul is dead, when Clement writes his first letter to this same church, we find that while they have followed Paul's commandments in nearly everything, still there remained that spirit of debate. While not inspired, Clement's letter is one of the very best in church history. That was not pleasing news, but Titus had some much more unpleasant news, towit: There was an incorrigible minority in the church who denounced Paul for writing instead of coming to them, saying that he kept promising, but did not keep his word; instead of coming he sends a letter, which was very weighty indeed, but he knew that in bodily presence he was weak and his speech was contemptible, and so he got out of his promise by writing a letter. They still questioned his apostolic authority, saying that he had never seen the Lord in the flesh, and was not one of the original twelve; that the fact that he worked for his living instead of demanding apostolic support showed that he was conscious of the weakness of his apostolic claim; that he did not demand a support for himself and wife as Peter and others did; that he did not have the true gospel which was taught by James and Peter. On account of this mixed news we have a mixed letter, just about as mixed a letter as was ever written.

In general terms this letter is divided into three parts. The first seven chapters, roughly speaking, are devoted

to a discussion of Paul's ministry and its methods. Chapters 8 and 9 are devoted to the great collection which he is still urging to be completed. Chapters 10, 11, 12, and 13 are devoted to meeting the criticisms of the incorrigible minority. There are a vast number of subdivisions. In these last chapters he is fighting a battle, not for his own life, but for the very life of the gospel itself. Those last chapters are very stern. They disclose a mortal combat.

By whom did Paul send this letter? By Titus, instructing him to finish that collection, and sends with Titus the messenger of the churches who had been chosen to take charge of the collections elsewhere. There is a reference to two of these messengers that has put the world to guessing who they were. These three men go back to Corinth with this letter.

In the character of the letter it is utterly unlike any other in the New Testament. If a window had been opened so that we could look right into Paul's heart, it would illustrate this letter. It brings out his personality more than any other or all the rest of his writings and speeches. It brings to light the secrets of his history that never would have been known but for this opposition. The picture of the man contained in this letter cannot be filled out in its outlines by any other man that ever lived on the face of the earth. One man, being asked the key word of this letter, said, "affliction." Paul tells of his sufferings and their purpose. Another man said that the key word was, "boasting;" he used the word boasting about twenty-two times in all the rest of his letters and twenty-nine times in this letter. In other words, he is forced to refer to himself and discuss himself in order to furnish those who befriend him the means to reply to his adversaries. He has put the weapons into

their hands, since they don't know these things as he knew them.

We now are ready to take up the letter itself. Before I get through with it I will give a more extensive outline. All that I have discussed so far has been under the head of historical introduction.

The first item of the outline is, the salutation, verses 1 and 2: "Paul, an apostle of Christ Jesus through the will of God, and Timothy our brother, unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints that are in the whole of Achaia: Grace to you and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ." We have already learned how Paul opens a letter with a salutation, so we pass at once to the thanksgiving which extends from the third to the seventh verse. It was Paul's habit, after saluting properly, to express whatever grounds for thanksgiving he had, and just look at this:

"Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Father of mercies and God of all comforts; who comforteth us in all our affliction, that we may be able to comfort them that are in any affliction, through the comfort wherewith we ourselves are comforted of God. For as the sufferings of Christ abound unto us, even so our comfort also aboundeth through Christ. But whether we are afflicted, it is for your comfort and salvation; or whether we are comforted, it is for your comfort, which worketh in the patient enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer; and our hope for you is steadfast; knowing that, as ye are partakers of the sufferings, so also are ye of the comfort."

He thus prepares the way to discuss the most unparalleled sufferings and afflictions, and then gets his thanksgiving out of them. His thanksgiving is that God so comforts in those afflictions that it enables him to comfort

other people in their afflictions. If one were about to write a letter to a far-off friend, and after the salutation he should commence: "I have great reason to be thankful. Yesterday I broke my leg. Day before yesterday my house was burned, and the week before that my horse died, and today I was robbed, and I learned this evening that I am to be sent to jail," it would startle the friend. So a man who can get a thanksgiving out of Paul's bill of fare has a power of gratitude in him that cannot be exceeded.

I once heard of an old brother from whom one could not get a single doleful statement, no matter what the circumstances were. He would not whine, nor mouth, nor complain. Once, when there did not seem a thing left to him on earth, he got up and said, "Brethren, I am thankful because the only two teeth in my head meet."

Commencing with verse 8, Paul begins to refer to some of those sufferings (an account of the same sufferings is given in Acts 19): "For we would not have you ignorant, brethren, concerning our affliction which befell us in Asia, that we were weighted down exceedingly, beyond our power, insomuch that we despaired even of life; yea, we ourselves have had the sentence of death within ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God who raiseth the dead." Couple this with, "If after the manner of men I fought with beasts at Ephesus." This language here, coupled with the language about fighting with beasts, makes me believe that at one time Paul was thrown into the arena, and, as he had once been stoned and accounted for dead, and the brethren came and worked until they brought him back to life, so here he says of God, "Who delivered us out of so great a death, and will deliver; on whom we have set our hope that He will also still deliver us." That is one of the

afflictions, and one of his sufferings. He had been sentenced to death. The sentence had been executed. God had delivered him from death, and he believed that God would continue to deliver him.

He continues: "Ye also helping together on our behalf by your supplication; that, for the gift bestowed upon us by means of many, thanks may be given by many persons on our behalf." See how he gets his thanksgiving again: "God delivered me, but it came partly through your supplication. You and a great many other people were praying for Paul." So when Peter was put in jail, the church met and prayed for him, and God delivered Peter. Paul thus shows how other people could get comfort out of his sufferings if they would take it. How many people are pessimists! Mr. Ready-to-Halt, Mr. Despondency, Mr. Man-with-the-Blues, the man against whom everything is working, now, if your spiritual liver gets out of order in that direction, I prescribe for you a generous dose of the thankful spirit of Paul.

The next item in the outline is his defense against some accusations that had been made and reported to him by Titus. That is found in verse 13. Some of them had accused Paul of "wire-pulling" by a secret letter. I heard of a preacher once, who, having to go away from his church for about a month, wrote to a leading sister and suggested how she might, unknown to him, get up a big reception on the occasion of his return. They accused Paul of working up things by writing a letter of that kind. Here is the way he replied: "For we write no other things unto you than what you read or even acknowledge, and I hope ye will acknowledge unto the end." The letters are all public, and the charge is that they be read to all the church.

In verse 15, and on through chapter 1 and part of

chapter 2, he defends himself from the charge of light-mindedness and fickleness. Notice what he says in verse 17: "When I therefore was thus minded, did I show fickleness?" The charge of fickleness is based upon this, that he had sent word to them from Ephesus that when he went to Macedonia he would come by Corinth first; that he would speedily come; but he had not come; that instead of coming he wrote another letter, and they had charged that the reason that he did not come was on account of his personal presence. He defends himself from that charge of not fulfilling his promise. Let's see how he does it. The preceding verse states his confidence that he would be their glory, and they would be his glory, in the day of the Lord. Now he says, "In this confidence I was minded to come first unto you [not to go to Macedonia and then come to Corinth, but to come by you on my way to Macedonia], that ye might have a second benefit; and by you to pass into Macedonia, and again from Macedonia to come unto you, and of you to be set forward on my journey unto Judæa. When I therefore was thus minded [and had promised accordingly], did I show fickleness? or the things that I purpose, do I purpose according to the flesh, that with me there should be the yea yea, and the nay nay?"

On that expression a great novel of modern times is written, "Richard Yea and Nay." The author of that book takes the most heroic character in England and presents him to us first one way and then another, to show that he did not follow out any steadfast line that looked to the good of his country, but merely the present moment of passion or impulse. If the impulse came he would go to Scotland today and declare war on France tomorrow. Paul says, "My purpose was not a flesh-purpose, nor following my desires, but it was based upon

my then conception of your condition and conditions elsewhere. When conditions changed so that God would be glorified by changing the plan, I changed it. Does that make me fickle? If that change resulted from some fleshly impulse, I would be 'Paul Yea and Nay,' but the change was brought about solely for the glory of God and the good of those to whom the promises were made."

He now begins to make a bigger defense than that: "But as God is faithful, our word toward you is not yea and nay." In other words, "You say my word is yea and nay. I want to tell you something that is not yea and nay. The gospel I preached to you was not yea and nay gospel."

Dr. E. C. Dargan, then of the Louisville Seminary, preached at the Baptist Convention in Belton in 1892, and he took this theme: "The gospel is not yea and nay, but yea and amen." "For how many soever be the promises of God, in him is the yea; wherefore also through him is the Amen, unto the glory of God through us." He treated that subject this way: The gospel of Jesus Christ is not yea and nay; it is one thing. We can rely on it; it is yea and amen, the "yea" in God and the "Amen" in us. God tells us that He will say "Amen, amen, amen!" We may get this whole sermon from that one line of thought, and so we may preach a sermon on the subject, "The Gospel is not yea and nay."

QUESTIONS

1. Out of what does the second letter to the Corinthians grow, and who wrote it?
2. When did he write it, and where?
3. What the occasion of this letter?
4. What the three favorable items of Titus' report to Paul concerning the Corinthians?
5. What the first unfavorable item of Titus' report, and what illustration from the author's experience cited?
6. What spirit prevailed in the church at Corinth at this time,

according to the report of Titus, and what later light of history touching this spirit of the Corinthians?

7. What the third unfavorable item of Titus' report, and what the points of authority questioned?

8. What, in general terms, a brief analysis of the book, and what the nature of the latter part of the book?

9. By whom did Paul send this letter, and with what instruction?

10. What the character of this letter, what two key-words suggested, and what do you think is the key-word?

11. Quote, from memory, the salutation.

12. What is Paul's ground of thanksgiving in this letter, and are such thanksgivings common among even Christians? Illustrate.

13. What unparalleled sufferings does Paul here describe, and where else do we find an account of the same sufferings?

14. What the author's interpretation of II Cor. 1:9, 10, and why?

15. What credit does Paul give the Corinthians for his delivery, and what parallel in the history of Peter?

16. What a good prescription for Mr. Ready-to-Halt, Mr. Despondency and Mr. Man-with-the-Blues?

17. What charge, inferable from 1:13, did they bring against Paul, and what his defense?

18. What charge, inferable from 1:15-17, did they bring against him, and how does he answer it?

19. What great novel was written on 1:17, and what the purpose of the author of the book?

20. What great sermon cited on 1:18-20, and what the import of the sermon?

XXVII

THE TWO COVENANTS

Scripture: II Cor. 1:21–3:18

IN the last of chapter 1 there is one passage that we need to discuss: "Now he that established us with you in Christ, and anointed us, is God; who also sealed us, and gave us the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." Some words used here a Christian ought to understand. For instance, "anointed," "sealed," "earnest." In the Old Testament, prophets, priests and kings were anointed with the "holy anointing oil" whose recipe Moses gave in Ex. 30:22-33. As a ceremony it signified their consecration, or setting apart, to office. As a symbol it signified the influence of the Holy Spirit which qualified them to perform their official duties. In the New Testament it means that the Holy Spirit, received by faith, qualifies every Christian to be a priest of God, to offer spiritual sacrifices. The word "anointed," I say, refers to the influence that comes upon the Christian in the sense of setting him apart for the work of Christ and qualifying him to do it. As the Old Testament priest, prophet and king were anointed for an office, so is every Christian. We are all kings and priests unto God. Without the Holy Spirit we cannot acceptably serve God.

The word "seal" has a different signification.

It is quite common in Pedo-baptist literature to refer to baptism as a seal, but in the Word of God baptism is

nowhere called a seal. On the contrary, we are expressly said to be sealed by the Holy Spirit.

The object of a seal is to accredit or designate ownership. For instance, a man writes a letter and puts the mark of his seal on it; that authenticates the letter. If a seminary confers a degree or sells a piece of property, neither degree nor deed is valid unless it bears the corporate seal of the seminary. We are said to be sealed by the Holy Spirit. That simply means this—that the gift of the Holy Spirit to a Christian authenticates that Christian as God's property. Suppose I address a communication and put my seal on it; that seal is designed to keep the communication intact until it gets to its address. So we are sealed unto the day of redemption.

That is a very strong argument in favor of the final preservation of the saints. The imprint of the Holy Spirit on us is a mark that we belong to God and will be delivered to God on the day of redemption. If the seal of God does hold (and there is no power that can break it) that is demonstrative that the Christian will reach his destination.

There is still another word—"given the earnest of the Spirit in our hearts." An "earnest" is something of this kind: The holy land was promised to the Israelites. Spies were sent to look out the country and sample it. They brought back a bunch of grapes, and the people were enabled to eat those grapes before they got to the country where the grapes grew. They were the same in kind, but not the same in quantity. God intends that our promised land shall be heaven; but before we get to heaven He gives us foretastes in kind of what we are to get when we reach heaven; the joy, peace and glory that often comes to the Christian heart here on earth is an earnest of what heaven will be. It is a little piece of

heaven, sent down to us beforehand. How often in a great revival we hear brethren say, "This is heaven on earth! We are getting foretastes of the glory of God." The sense of forgiveness, the sweet peace that comes in the heart on reconciliation with God, the joy of the converted soul—anything of that kind is an earnest of heaven.

The first part of chapter 2 is devoted to a case of discipline. In the first letter he had written very sharply in a way to bring grief to their hearts because they had allowed an awful sin, committed by one of their members, to go unrebuked. He is now explaining to them why he made them sorry: "If I make you sorry, who then is he that maketh me glad but he that is made sorry by me? And I wrote this very thing, lest, when I came, I should have sorrow from them of whom I ought to rejoice; having confidence in you all, that my joy is the joy of you all. For out of much affliction and anguish of heart I wrote unto you with many tears; not that ye should be made sorry, but that ye might know the love which I have more abundantly unto you." That sharp letter he wrote was prompted by love. He saw that they were getting themselves into trouble. He adds, "But if any hath caused sorrow, he hath caused sorrow, not to me, but in part (that I press not too heavily) to you all. Sufficient to such a one is this punishment which was inflicted by the many." When they came to expel that man they could not get a unanimous vote, for some stood for him.

That conveys this lesson to us, that in expelling a man it is not necessary that the vote should be unanimous; a majority vote is sufficient for expulsion or any discipline whatever.

It is different in the reception of a member. Pastors and churches sometimes have to show why it is that a

majority vote is sufficient to expel a man, and here is the text. The word "many" means majority. This case also contains another important lesson on discipline: "Sufficient to such a one is the punishment inflicted by the *majority;* so that contrariwise ye should rather forgive him and comfort him, lest by any means such a one should be swallowed up with his overmuch sorrow. Wherefore I beseech you to confirm your love toward him. For this end also did I write, that I might know the proof of you, whether ye are obedient in all things. But to whom ye forgive anything, I forgive also; for what I also have forgiven, if I have forgiven anything, for your sakes have I forgiven it."

That raises the question: What is the object of discipline? To gain the offending brother. Even when we exclude him, if he be a Christian, and his exclusion is conducted properly, it will likely have that effect on him. It had that effect in this case. When this man saw that this church by a majority vote decided that he was living in a sin of such heinousness that it disqualified him for membership in a church of Jesus Christ, it broke his heart and he repented of his sin. Paul says, "Let that punishment of expulsion be sufficient, and on his repentance forgive him and take him back again." That is the point in discipline.

All the rest of the letter until we come to chapter 8 is on Paul's ministry: "Now when I came to Troas for the gospel of Christ, and when a door was opened unto me in the Lord, I had no relief for my spirit, because I found not Titus, my brother; but taking my leave of them, I went forth into Macedonia." The thought is that a man who loves to preach the gospel and is holding a meeting where the door of success is open, may yet have such a burden on his heart about other matters that

he cannot fulfill his duty as a preacher. Paul is distressed to death about that case at Corinth for fear that the church should go astray and be lost from the churches of Jesus Christ, as he says elsewhere that the case of all the churches was resting on his apostolic heart. Many a time when the preacher preaches he carries a burden that nobody else knows anything about. Sometimes he has a burden on him right in the midst of a meeting that does not touch the meeting, coming from circumstances elsewhere that divert his mind and press on his heart.

Then he says, "But thanks be unto God, who always leadeth us in triumph in Christ, and maketh manifest through us the savor of His knowledge in every place."

Notice that always and in every place the true preacher triumphs.

Paul explains how that is: "For we are a sweet savor of Christ unto God, in them that are saved, and in them that perish; to the one a savor from death unto death; to the other a savor from life unto life." Some preachers think if they preach, and people are not saved, they have failed. If the preacher preaches God's gospel where He wants him to preach, he wins a victory over the lost if not over the saved.

In other words, God intends that the terms of mercy contained in His gospel should be submitted to people whether they receive it or reject it, and that there is no responsibility attaching to the preacher in the issue.

If they reject it, the gospel is to them a savor of death unto death, and of life unto life, if they accept it. I do not know any other part of the scripture so little understood as that statement.

One night, when I was a young pastor, a brother pastor came to see me, very much distressed. He said, "My

ministry is a failure." I said, "I am disposed to question that." He said, "I cannot disguise it from myself; it is a dead failure. I have preached for a solid year in tears and in earnestness and nobody in my community has been convicted of sin." I said, "That does not prove that you have failed. If you had preached without praying or studying or asking God to give you the right message, I would agree with you that your ministry is a failure. But if you have preached in faith, in tears, in prayer, faithfully holding up the gospel, you have won the victory," and I read this passage. He was so impressed that he got right down on the floor at my house, and such a thanksgiving I never heard. He said, "Do you know that you have saved my life? I felt like quitting the ministry because I was in such despair." Generally, we should look for success in the salvation of men, and that should be our principal desire in preaching, and generally that will be the result, but sometimes it will not. "But always in every place God causeth us triumph."

Chapter 3 commences with a reference to letters of recommendation: "Are we beginning again to commend ourselves, or need we, as do some, epistles of commendation to you or from you? Ye are our epistle, written in our hearts, known and read of all men; being made manifest that ye are an epistle of Christ, ministered by us, written not with ink, but with the Spirit of the living God; not in tables of stone, but in tables that are hearts of flesh." He uses two figures about the letters: First, in his heart it is written; second, Christ, using him as a penman, wrote a letter on their hearts, and that letter that Christ wrote could be known and read of all men—not written with ink and pen, but with the Spirit. It was not written like the commandments of Moses, on tables

of stone, but on the fleshly tables of the heart. He says, "I don't need a letter of recommendation, as some other people do. The Jewish brethren came bringing letters from the Jerusalem church, and they had stirred up all this trouble. They needed letters of recommendation. You heard the gospel through me. I built on no other man's foundation, but led you to Christ. If you want to know where my letter of recommendation is, look on yourselves. Christ dictated; I wrote the letter, and it is a long ways better than a letter written in ink." An ink-letter oftentimes means very little.

Once a man came into my office and asked me for a letter of recommendation. I said, "I do not even know you." He said, "That is all right; you can tell them about me." I said, "Why do you not tell them about yourself? Your word would mean as much as my letter. You have come to the wrong place; I never write a letter of recommendation unless I know what I am writing about." Again, a certain man wanted me to commend a book. I said, "I have never read that book." "Well, I will show you its prospectus," said he. "But the prospectus is not the book. Do you think I would commend a book that I have not read, and do you think I would trade my name for a single book?" "Well," he said, "other people do that way." "Yes," I said, "and that is the reason that their letters of recommendation are not worth anything."

It is a suspicious thing for a man to carry his valise full of recommendations. I once knew a preacher who carried around a scrap book in which he had preserved every foolish thing that had ever been said in his favor by the newspapers. My father used to say, "Whenever you see a chimney with a big log up against it, you may know that it is a weak chimney, and needs to be propped."

The object of a letter of recommendation is simply to give a person an introduction, and then let him stand for himself.

The poorest preacher and the poorest pastor I ever saw had twenty-three letters of recommendation and several degrees from colleges.

The most important thought in connection with these letters of recommendation is that, after all, everything must be judged by its fruits, and every man must be known by his works. What is Christianity? Christ wrote a letter. Where is that letter? That Corinthian church. Is there anything different between what they are now and what they were before their conversion? Yes, a great deal of difference, and all that difference is in favor of the Christian religion that worked the change. We may tell a man about the effects of Christianity, and he will take all we say with a grain of salt, but if we show him actual cases of changed people, they become letters of recommendation for the Christian religion.

If the one who joins the church remains as he was before, it proves nothing; but if Christianity makes better husbands, wives, brothers, sisters, and citizens, the whole wide world can read that letter.

An infidel once said to me that there was one woman in my church who had really been converted, or changed, and that the change was for the better, and that was one argument for Christianity that he could not answer.

The next thought is in verses 5 and 6: "But our sufficiency is from God; who also made us sufficient as ministers of a new covenant; not of the letter, but of the Spirit: for the letter killeth." The lesson from that word, "sufficient," should sink down into every preacher's heart. It is not because a man is six feet tall; Paul was a low man. It is not because a man is pretty; Paul was

ugly. It is not because a man is clear-eyed; Paul was dim-eyed. It is not because a man is sound in health; Paul was in ill health. It is not because a man is a rhetorician; Paul did not use his rhetoric. *"Our sufficiency is of God."* We cannot put too much emphasis on that thought.

I was stopping once in Louisville. The brethren, hearing I was there, sent for me to make a talk to the Seminary boys, and I combined two passages which say, "Good and able ministers of Jesus Christ." I took that as my theme. What is a *good* preacher? This refers to character. What is an *able* preacher? This refers to efficiency. I do not think I ever made a better talk to preachers than I made that night.

Now comes in the ministry of Paul, commencing at verse 7, showing a distinction between the two covenants. We have already had one distinction,—that the old covenant was written on tables of stone and the new covenant on tables of the heart. Here we have another: "But if the ministration of death, written, and engraven on stones, came with glory." The old covenant was the ministration of death. The law gendered to bondage. The soul that sinneth shall die. The new covenant is the ministration of life. We cannot save men by the law. We can kill them, but we save men by the gospel. That distinction should be kept sharp in mind. It was a very solemn thing when God came down on Mt. Sinai, crested with fire, and shaken with thunder, illumined with lightning, and the beat of the angel-pinions filled the air—it was a glorious thing. But what is that to the ministration of life through the gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ? The law came by Moses, but grace and truth by Jesus Christ our Savior, who abolished death, and brought life and immortality to light through the gospel. The law—the

ministration of death—is written on cold rock, outside of man. The gospel—the ministration of life—is written on the warm heart, inside of man. Paul, in Heb. 8:7-12, says in speaking of the two covenants, "For if that first covenant had been faultless, then would no place have been sought for a second. For finding fault with them, He saith,

"Behold, the days come, saith the Lord,
That I will make a new covenant with the house of Israel and
with the house of Judah;
Not according to the covenant that I made with their fathers
In the day that I took them by the hand to lead them forth out
of the land of Egypt;
For they continued not in my covenant,
And I regarded them not, saith the Lord.
For this is the covenant that I will make with the house of Israel
After those days, saith the Lord;
I will put my laws into their mind,
And on their heart also will I write them:
And I will be to them a God,
And they shall be to me a people:
And they shall not teach every man his fellow-citizen,
And every man his brother, saying, know the Lord:
For all shall know me,
From the least to the greatest of them.
For I will be merciful to their iniquities,
And their sins will I remember no more."

Then Paul adds, "In that He saith, a new covenant, He hath made the first old. But that which is becoming old and waxeth aged is nigh unto vanishing away." The new covenant is internal, and nothing has been done until the writing touches on the inside.

The glory of the old covenant was reflected in the face of Moses. When he came down from the mount his face was shining so that it dazzled the eyes of the people. But that was nothing like the shining of the transfiguration of Christ. The shining of Moses' face was transitory. Moses put a veil over his face. He knew that the shining would pass away and his face would be as it was before.

He veiled his face lest the Jews should see the end of the shining, and would not follow him. But the Jews believed that he veiled his face because it was too bright to look at, and that if the veil was lifted off, the face of Moses would outshine any face in the world.

Mightily does Tom Moore bring out the thought in "The Veiled Prophet of Khorasan," in Lalla Rookh. An impostor, wearing a veil, played upon the superstition of the people, saying that no mortal could endure the brightness of the splendor of his face, and in mercy to them he kept his face veiled. But he promised some day to uncover his face that they might see his glory. His object was to pre-commit them, and so bring them to absolute despair and ruin at the unveiling. One of the most pathetic things in poetry is where the prophet lifted his veil that the ruined Zelica might see his face; that she might see the horrible face of the demon who had deceived her. What must be the unveiling of the Law-covenant to the lost dupes who have trusted it?

The next point is, that the Old Testament is a ministration of condemnation: "For if the ministration of condemnation hath glory, much rather doth the ministration of righteousness exceed in glory." The word "righteousness" here should be rendered "justification." The thought is that the old covenant condemns men; the new covenant justifies men. The preacher ought to be able to distinguish between those two points, condemnation and justification.

The next point is that the old covenant was written in types, veiling the truth signified. He says, "Having therefore such a hope, we use great boldness of speech, and are not as Moses, who put a veil upon his face." Moses set forth things in allegories and types. Boldness, or plainness of speech here, refers to absence of figures of

speech. That is the difference between telling a thing in straight-out language, and in using parables. The gospel makes the way of life very plain, so that a fool cannot misunderstand. In much of the Old Testament we have to study so as to find the signification of the type or of the prophetic visions. They were but shadows.

Notice again the old covenant dazzled the eye—verse 18: "But we all, with unveiled face beholding as in a mirror the glory of the Lord, are transformed into the same image from glory to glory, even as from the Lord the Spirit." The verse preceding says, "The Lord is the spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is,. there is liberty." Mirrors in those days were made of hammered and polished metal, and made a dim reflection. The sun may be out of sight, but the moon is a mirror catching the light of the sun and reflecting it to the eye of the beholder.

I am going to give you what I call a very impressive illustration. In Prescott's "Conquest of Peru," there is a description of the Temple of the Incas at Cuzco. This Temple consists of three walls, north, south, west. The eastern side of the structure was open. The walls were smoothly cemented, and on the cement was put thinly hammered gold. The way they worshiped was this: They would come to the Temple just before dawn and stand in that opening to the east, and facing the western wall—a golden wall; on the left a golden wall; and on the right a golden wall. The sun would rise behind them, and long before they could see it directly they could see its reflection in the western wall, and be covered with the golden light. Their faces were illumined in the reflection. Now we all look into the mirror upon the glory of the Lord, and that mirror reflects it on us, and we catch the reflected image and are changed in it from glory to glory; as the

sun behind those people rising higher, blazing brighter, bathed them more and more in its reflected light, so the Lord of righteousness, as He rises, brings healing in His wings. We look at Christ as in a mirror. He is not here, but we see Him mirrored in the face of His saints. It is a law that we become like that which we steadfastly contemplate. If we steadily study about good, pure and holy things, we become like them. If we study about evil things, vile and loathsome and slimy, we become like them. We steadfastly behold the glorious things of the gospel as in a mirror and become transformed ourselves, more and more like Jesus, and at last become altogether like Him in image.

QUESTIONS

1. What three important words in 1:21, 22 which need to be understood?
2. What the meaning and application of the word, "anointed?"
3. Discuss the word, "seal," showing its application by illustrations.
4. What the meaning of "earnest," what the illustration given, and what the spiritual significance of it?
5. To what is the first part of chapter 2 devoted, and what connection has this with the first letter?
6. What the history of this case, and what important lesson for us in it?
7. What lesson here as to the object of discipline, and how is it clearly shown in this case?
8. To what is the next section, 2:12—7:16, devoted, and what the lesson of 2:12, 13?
9. What the ground of Paul's thanksgiving here, and how could Paul say, "God always leadeth us in triumph?" Illustrate.
10. What lesson for us here on the question of letters of recommendation, and what the explanation of Paul's two figures of speech relative to this matter? Illustrate.
11. What the most important thought in connection with these letters of recommendation, and how does the author illustrate it?
12. What lesson here as to our sufficiency, and how does this idea relate to "Good and able ministers of Jesus Christ?"
13. What two distinctions here noted between the new covenant and the old?
14. What prophet does Paul quote to show the difference between the old covenant and the new, where do we find this quotation, and how does this prophet show the difference?

15. Give an account of the shining face of Moses, and illustrate with the incident of "The Veiled Prophet of Khorasan."

16. How is the O. T. a ministration of condemnation, in what does the ministration of righteousness exceed the ministration of the O. T., and what the meaning of the word, "righteousness," here?

17. What difference between the O. T. and the N. T. expressed in 3: 12, and how is this illustrated in the case of Moses veiling his face?

18. What Paul's mirror-illustration, and how is this illustrated by the author?

XXVIII

THE GOSPEL MINISTRY AND THE GLORY THAT IS TO COME

Scripture: II Cor. 4:1–5:15

THIS discussion commences with II Cor. 4, and I will call attention only to points of special interest as we pass along in the exposition. We made a point in the preceding chapter that when the Jew read the Old Testament he read it with a veil over his eyes. In this chapter Paul anticipates this objection: "Is not the gospel itself veiled to some, as well as the law?" Here is his reply, verse 3: "And even if our gospel is veiled, it is veiled in them that perish; in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of the unbelieving, that the light of the gospel of the glory of Christ, who is the image of God, should not dawn upon them. For we preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus as Lord, and ourselves as your servants for Jesus' sake. Seeing it is God, that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." His reply is that the gospel is veiled only for a certain class of people —them that perish.

The reason it is veiled in that case is that the devil has blinded their eyes that they cannot see. The veil is on the eye, and not on the gospel. That is a very important matter. If at night we should point to a lamp in a room

and ask a by-stander, "Do you see that light?" and he were to say, "No;" if we take him out of doors and show him the milky way, and the stars, and ask, "Do you see those lights up yonder?" "No;" or if we should show him the moon and say, "Do you see that light?" "No;" or wait until morning and point out the sun rising in the east, and say, "Do you see the light of that sun?" "No;" what would that prove to us? *That the man was blind!* If he were not a blind man he could see the light. In that case those lights were not hid, but were shining in all their brightness. The trouble was with the beholder, who had no eyes to see. Preachers oftentimes wonder that the unconverted cannot see how very plain the gospel of Jesus Christ is. They look at the people and talk contrition: "Do you see that light?" "No." They talk about repentance and explain it: "Do you see that?" "No." They talk about faith in Jesus Christ and ask, "Do you see that?" "No, I don't understand it." Whenever a case of that kind occurs the fault is in the vision of the one addressed. The truth is that the devil has blinded his inner spiritual eyes that he may not see and be converted.

Paul says that his commission was to the Gentiles, to turn them from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto God. There is a spiritual blindness. Our Savior referred repeatedly in His preaching to people having eyes to see and seeing not, and having ears to hear and hearing not. That is one thing we must always take into account—the power of Satan to blind people so that they cannot see. Suppose I shut my left eye, and hold a dollar over my right eye and look up—can I see anything? The light is shining, but there is an object between me and the light, and it does not take a very big piece of money to hide the spiritual light from some peo-

ple; a quarter of a dollar will sometimes do it. As a quarter laid on a dead man's eye keeps his eye closed, so the love of money shuts out everything else in the world from the vision. That is his reply to the objections about the gospel being veiled.

Look now at his comparison between conversion and the creation of light in the first chapter of Genesis. It is there said that the earth was without form and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep, and God said, Let there be light. And there was light. Paul says, "Seeing it is God that said, Light shall shine out of darkness, who shined in our hearts, to give the light of the knowledge of the glory of God in the face of Jesus Christ." As the brooding of the Holy Spirit over the chaos of original matter brought out light, so in the spiritual world the unconverted man is in a chaotic state, everything mixed, darkness on the deep of his mind, and the first sign of regeneration to him is light. "Whatsoever maketh manifest is light."

I may be standing by a man perfectly satisfied with himself. "Not a wave of trouble rolls across his peaceful breast." He has committed a great many sins, but has no spiritual realization of his state. I may keep preaching to that man, and presenting one truth after another, and whatsoever that will make manifest to him that he is a sinner, that is light. After a while I may present a thought, and as if a lamp had been lighted and carried down into his heart, the secret things of his inmost soul are revealed to him. As that light shines down there, he sees himself a sinner against God. Paul in the first letter gives a description of it, I Cor. 14: "If all prophesy, and there come in one unbelieving or unlearned, he is reproved by all, he is judged by all; the secrets of his heart are made manifest; and so he will fall down on

his face and worship God." When a man is in a cellar he may think that he is as clean as an angel, but bring him up out of that dark pit into daylight and he will see the smut, coal-dust, and dirty hands. The light does not create those spots but simply manifests them. Paul says, "I was alive without the law once, that is, I felt myself all right. But when the commandment came, sin revived, and I died. As soon as the light shone into my heart, and I saw myself a lost sinner in the sight of God, dead in trespasses and sins, I died." That is a very impressive biblical illustration.

Take verse 7: He is talking about his ministry—indeed all this is about Paul's ministry—the chapter commencing: "Therefore seeing we have this ministry." Here he says that they had this gospel-treasure in earthen vessels, that the power might be shown to be of God, not of the man-vessel, or earthen-vessel. What a theme for a sermon! Paul and Barnabas quarreled—both great preachers and good men—earthen vessels. We see a preacher who seems to be a great power in leading souls to Christ. When we get close to him and he is off his guard, we detect frailties and infirmities. We are disillusioned. A preacher sometimes wonders why a gospel so pure, intended to bring about purity, to fit one for heaven, should have been placed in the hands of such frail beings for administration. Why not have placed it in the hands of spotless beings? Why not have made the angels preachers? Paul says one reason is that when a man is converted God wants it to be known that the greatness of the power of conversion did not lie in the messenger that brought the message. The messenger was an earthen vessel, but the message was divine.

He goes on to illustrate this earthen vessel, and answers

another question: How is it, then, if the vessel be earthy—if the preacher be a man of such infirmity and frailty—that he can go on and be a successful preacher? He responds to that this way? "We are pressed on every side, yet not straightened; perplexed, yet not unto despair; pursued, yet not forsaken; smitten down, yet not destroyed; always bearing about in the body the dying of Jesus, that the life also of Jesus may be manifested in our body. . . . So then death worketh in us, but life in you." His explanation is that the omnipotent power of God sustains this messenger of light, though he be frail, perplexed, pursued, cast down. "The bruised reed He will not break and the smoking wick He will not quench until He hath brought forth judgment unto victory." This is a great consolation.

In verse 16 we reach our next thought. If the preacher that preaches this glorious gospel of God is himself earthly and frail, why does not the thought of this mortality utterly crush him? Here is his explanation: "Wherefore we faint not; but though our outward man is decaying, yet our inward man is renewed day by day. For our light affliction, which is for the moment, worketh for us more and more exceedingly an eternal weight of glory; while we look not at the things which are seen, but at the things which are not seen, for the things which are seen are temporal; but the things which are not seen are eternal."

The part of the preacher that is earthy, breaking down all the time, is the outward man. The inward man does not break down; he is renewed day by day, and lives the life of Christ who lives in him, and while he is conscious that the human side of him is mortal, and constantly crumbling, that does not discourage him.

Nothing of that kind can discourage him, because he is

not looking at the temporal things, but he is looking at the invisible and eternal things.

He then comes to the climax of death. A preacher, though he be as great as Paul, may die at any time. What about that? He commences the next chapter with his answer: "For we know that if the earthly house of our tabernacle be dissolved, we have a building from God, a house not made with hands," but God will give a heavenly home for the soul. Finally, Jesus will come and raise and glorify the body in the grave, and this glorified body will never die. He carries that thought about with him all the time. It is one of the sweetest thoughts to me in all the Bible.

When this outward man perishes, and the soul-tenant has been evicted by death, or when the approach of death has chilled his feet and hands and crept up to his body, chilled his vitals, stopped his breath and the pulsations of his heart, and he is dead, there is no stop to the inward man. And this outward man that perished will be raised from the dead and glorified.

But we come to a more important thought than that—the resurrection is a long way off. Now, if the enemies of the gospel kill Paul, as they did kill him nearly 1900 years ago, what about him from then till now? Here is his answer to that, verse 6: "Being therefore always of good courage, and knowing that, whilst we are at home in the body, we are absent from the Lord (for we walk by faith, not by sight); we are of good courage, I say, and are willing rather to be absent from the body, and to be at home with the Lord."

When the body perishes, when the man's work is ended, without a break in the continuity of his being, instantly upon his death, his soul is where Jesus is.

Right here I have a controversy with the "middle-life"

brethren. They say that the soul of a Christian does not go directly to heaven, but lodges somewhere in a half-way house; that here it is under guard and safe keeping, and must wait until the judgment day. I frankly confess that that would not comfort me much, but if I know that at the very moment I am absent from the body I am present with the Lord, that is comfort. The question is, Where is the Lord? We know that He ascended into heaven, and we know that He ascended soul and body, and we know that He is sitting at the right hand of the Majesty on high. Certainly, after the resurrection of His body the Lord Jesus Christ did not lodge anywhere: "The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Stephen says, "I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of the Majesty on high."

Is Jesus lodged half-way between here and heaven? Paul says, "The very minute I die I am present with the Lord and that is the reason I am not discouraged." It is not only a beautiful thought but an intensely practical thought. I wish that all of my religion was as strong as my faith in the resurrection of the body. There is not a shadow of a doubt in my mind about either of those two points.

When I was a teacher and had just commenced preaching, a beautiful girl I used to know when we were in school together, a very gifted girl, and a particular friend of mine whom I thought to be the genius of the school, married a worthless man (as it proved), the son of a very wealthy man, very handsome, though he proved to be a great rascal, who broke her heart and abandoned her. I did not know what had become of her, and one evening there came a note from her saying, "Dear friend: It has been a long time since I saw you. I want to see

you once more before I die. Come to see me tonight if you want to see me one time before the judgment." I went to the house and she was propped up in bed, dying. She said, "I did not send for you to lead me to Christ, or to teach me how to die. I know that. I have been a great sufferer, much of it in body, but the most of it has been spiritual suffering. You have some idea, but you cannot have a full idea of the darkness that has clouded my life. You remember how bright my prospects were when we were at school. This is my last night on earth. I go out forever tonight. I want you to get somebody who believes as we do about the future life to come and sing to me of heaven." So I gathered a few members of the church and we sang,

"O, sing to me of heaven,
When I am called to die,
Sing songs of holy ecstasy,
To waft my soul on high."

As we sang you could see the play of light on her face, and when we got through she took up the last verse, and in a very faint, sweet voice, sang that verse, and it ended in a whisper, and that whisper was her last breath. She understood just what Paul means in our text, "When I am absent from the body I am present with the Lord."

Whoever does not believe that, cannot be a happy Christian. If the preacher believes it with all his heart and soul, he can comfort people, even though the treasure they have is in an earthen vessel—a poor frail old vessel —full of aches and pains subject to sickness and death.

The next thought is in verse 9: "Wherefore also we make it our aim, whether at home or absent, to be well-pleasing unto Him." In other words, "Whether in the body or out of the body, I want Him to see that I am trying to do what He told me to do, trying to live as He

told me to live, and if He looks at me out of the body, I want Him to see that I am coming right up to Him."

"His track I see and I'll pursue
The narrow way till Him I view."

He tells us the reason why that is an ever present thought with him. "For we must all be made manifest before the judgment-seat of Christ; that each one may receive the things done in the body, according to what he hath done, whether it be good or bad." Then if we ask Paul, "Why do you all the time seek to be well-pleasing to God?" he answers, "Because I know that at the judgment seat of Christ there will be a perfect revelation of my whole life." The same thought is presented in I Cor. 3, where he tells about the work that a man does: "If any man buildeth on the foundation gold, silver, costly stones, wood, hay, stubble; each man's work shall be made manifest; for the day shall declare it, because it is revealed in fire; and the fire itself shall prove each man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he built thereon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved; yet so as through fire." If a man is a Christian, on the foundation of Jesus Christ, he will be saved. But salvation is not everything.

We see two ships coming into a harbor from distant ports. As one comes in sight we see that every mast is broken and every shroud torn, its cargo lost, it has sprung a leak, and a harbor tug must tow it in. It just barely gets into port. The other ship comes in with every mast standing, with every sail filled, cargoed to the water's edge, meeting the shout of men and boom of artillery from the shore. That is the difference in dying Chris-

tians. Some have no reward. Others have great reward on account of their fidelity. When they believed in Christ, they were justified. That does not have to be done over. But a Christian's fidelity will be judged by what a man does.

Verse 11 contains another thought: "Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men." That accounts for his earnestness in addressing either Christians or sinners. It is a dreadful thing to fall into the hands of the living God, and, as Peter says, "The time is come for judgment to begin at the house of God: . . . And if the righteous is scarcely saved, where shall the ungodly and sinner appear?"

He now explains another thing, verse 13: "For whether we are beside ourselves, it is unto God; or whether we are of sober mind, it is unto you. For the love of Christ constraineth us." Some of his enemies had accused him of being a crazy man, saying that a man who would talk about hell-fire and judgment and all that stuff, must be seeing visions. Now he replies: "If I am beside myself, it is unto God." As he said on another occasion, "I am not mad, most excellent Festus, but speak forth words of truth and soberness." Here it is: "The love of Christ constrains me and impels me into this zeal which you object to."

The brothers and sisters of Jesus Christ objected to His zeal, and went one day to arrest Him as one would arrest a lunatic, because He worked without stopping to eat. Whenever you see an earnest Christian who does not count his life dear unto him, who puts the salvation of men above all bodily ease, lets it triumph over all thought of time, and bestirs himself in the might and power of the commission of God given unto him, a great many worldly-minded people will say, "He is a crank.

We want a preacher who doesn't get excited and who is too polite to say 'hell.' Let him say 'hades,' and not talk about eternal punishment."

Verse 15 leads us to another thought: "He died for all, that they that live should no longer live unto themselves, but unto Him who, for their sakes, died and rose again." I have heard at least twenty-five sermons preached on that, in which it was expounded in this way: "No man liveth unto himself, other people are interested in him and he must live with reference to other people." That is not the thought, but that we must live unto Christ, not for earthly pleasure or glory, but for Christ who purchased us, must we live. Some may say, "I will not go to my appointment today because it is raining and I might get wet." But another will say, "I am not living for myself, but for Christ. I am going to that place today if I have to swim a creek."

It is the creek-swimming men that shake the world—the briar-cutting men who will not allow obstacles to keep them from doing what God wants them to do.

Let a congregation get the idea of their pastor that he is a pink of perfection, can beat anybody in town tying a cravat, and wears the nicest little shoes, knows how to fasten a nosegay in his vest, and how to enter a room and entertain company; carries an umbrella so as not to burn his delicate skin, then what will be his power to awaken and save the lost? An umbrella is all right in its place, but what I want to impress is this—that a stalwart man, a real man, will accomplish more of the great things in the work than all of these little fellows. He will not stop to consider a thousand things that absorb the mind of the trivial man, but will go right straightforward to the accomplishment of his great purpose. I have heard these dainty essayists preach. I have

gone to their churches hungry and tried to get something—and failed.

It reminds me of the story of a preacher who tells this of himself: During the war he went to a house to get some supper. Army rations were poor, and he was very hungry. They had just a little butter and they all wanted to make it go as far as possible, so each one tried to hurry through in order to get another chance at the butter before it disappeared. He said that he could not get rid of the butter in his plate. He even tried to sop it up with his bread, but it did not have any taste to it. At last he looked up and saw through a knot-hole in the roof over his head that the moon was shining down through into his plate, and that all the time he had been sopping moonshine.

QUESTIONS

1. Is the gospel, as well as the law, veiled to some people, and what is the reply of Paul to this objection?
2. What reason for their blindness does Paul give, and how does the author illustrate it?
3. How does Paul show from his commission the spiritual blindness of the lost man, and what the teaching of Jesus on the same point?
4. Give clearly Paul's comparison between conversion and the creation of light.
5. How is a man led to see himself a sinner, and how may a church convict a sinner, as described in I Cor. 14? Illustrate.
6. How does Paul here show the weakness and imperfection of preachers, and what reason does he assign for the Lord's commissioning men instead of angels to preach?
7. What Paul's reply to the question, "If the preacher is so frail, how can he be successful?"
8. Why does not this thought of mortality utterly crush the preacher?
9. How does Paul answer the objection that the preacher may die at any time?
10. What about Paul from his death until now, what the "middle-life" theory, and how does the author refute the claim?
11. How does the author illustrate from his own experience his faith in the realities of heaven and the resurrection?
12. In view of this doctrine, what was Paul's great aim in life,

what reason does he assign for it, and where do we find the parallel thought expressed by Paul? State and illustrate.

13. How do we account for Paul's earnestness from 5:11, and what parallel thought expressed by Peter?

14. How does Paul answer the charge that he was crazy, what other similar accusation against him cited, and what his reply? What the meaning of the first clause of 5:14, and what the practical application of all this to present-day preaching?

15. What the meaning and application of 5:15? Illustrate.

XXIX

THE MINISTRY OF RECONCILIATION

Scripture: II Cor. 5:17–7:16

THIS discussion commences at II Cor. 5:17, and extends to the end of chapter 7. Before going forward with this discussion, I want to call attention to some critical questions involved in the preceding chapter. In 5:11, what is the meaning of the "fear of the Lord"—"Knowing therefore the fear of the Lord, we persuade men?" Does it mean that the dreadfulness of God, or the fear that men may have of God? My answer is that it means God's fearfulness or dreadfulness, His awful character in holding each sinner to strict account for all of his sins—"Knowing the fear of the Lord."

In 5:14, "The love of Christ constraineth us"—does the love of Christ here mean Christ's love for us, or our love for Christ that does the constraining? My answer is, it means our love for Christ, that is superinduced by our conception of Christ's love for us. When we relied upon Christ's love for us, that awakened our love for Christ, and that constrains us to do what we do for Christ. What is the meaning of "constrain?" That is, does it simply mean to impel, or does it manifest its etymological meaning of narrowing down or shutting up to, so that we cannot do anything but that? Virtually it means the latter—that my love for Christ shuts me up to doing what I do. In other words, Luther said when they

demanded that he recant, "Here I stand; I can do no other." That is, his love of Christ put it out of his power to abjure his conception of justification by faith.

Verse 17 says, "Wherefore if any man is in Christ, he is a new creature." "Therefore" always refers back, and there are two things to which it refers back: (1) Verse 15, that Christ died for us, and so we are under obligation not to live unto ourselves, but unto Christ. (2) Verse 16, "As Christ died for us, we henceforth know no man, after the flesh, but according to the Spirit." These are the two reasons why a man is a new creature. The old things have passed away, meaning that old things are covered by new things. After conversion, a man is a new creature. Before conversion a man is his own guide, and the knowledge he has is after worldly understanding.

I once heard a sermon preached on this text, and one of the members said, "I have found out by that text that I am not a Christian." I said, "Why?" He said, "Old things have not passed away, and all things have not become new. My wife is not new. The sun shines as it did before, and I get hungry as I did before. According to that sermon I am not converted." That preacher did not understand the force of the "therefore." He did not see in what respects a man was new—that he is new in that he no longer lives unto himself but unto Christ, and no longer forms his judgment by worldly knowledge, but by spiritual knowledge. All of the old things that touch these points have passed away.

I heard a very prominent Baptist preacher, without knowledge of Greek, or a critical study of the text, preach on that text to set forth the evidences of conversion. He enumerated a dozen evidences by which one might know he was a Christian, without noticing either one of the two that the text expresses. When he got through I

said, "Whenever you take a text there is always a better sermon in it, according to its true meaning, than any sermon you can preach away from it. Everything you said was true, but you ought to have gotten it from other scriptures."

In preaching on the evidences of conversion from this text one must confine himself to this line of thought—that an unconverted man lives unto himself and decides all questions according to the way it pleases him, but the converted man is a new creature in that respect, and decides things as Christ would have him decide, though contrary to his inclinations.

When the Baptist General Convention met at Belton I preached a sermon on "The Ministerial Office," and commenced the sermon with stating that every preacher was under obligation when he selected a text to give its primary meaning and then its contextual meaning. Then he may deduce from the principles involved a new line of thought. But his new theme must be a logical development from the primary and contextual meaning. He should never take a text and preach a sermon without telling what it means primarily, and in its context. The most suitable description of a sermon that violates this rule is credited to a Negro: First, he took his text; second, he left it; third, he never got back to it.

The new creation may mean a great deal more than Paul says here, but all the meaning here is that a man who is in Christ no longer lives unto himself, but unto Christ, and no longer judges according to the spirit of the flesh, but after the Spirit of God.

We now come to the most important part of this second letter. We may make mistakes about some things in this letter, and the mistakes will not be fatal, but if we make a mistake on the *reconciliation* part of this letter we have

made a radical mistake. Verses 18-21 contain a brief discussion of reconciliation. If one understands these verses, he is a pretty sound theologian. The word "reconciliation," first of all, implies that there has been a previous enmity. Second, the ground of the enmity is that man is a sinner. Third, it implies that, being a sinner, he is lost. All of that can be brought out in this passage clearly.

What does reconciliation mean? That the two at enmity have been brought to perfect peace. Who is the author of this reconciliation? "All things are of God, who reconciled us to himself." There never was a case where a man at enmity with God was himself the cause or the occasion of the reconciliation. Then what is the meritorious ground of the reconciliation? "Who reconciled us to himself through Jesus Christ." The ground of the reconciliation is what Jesus has done. What the method of the reconciliation? "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself, not reckoning unto them their trespasses." They must be reckoned somewhere. Look at the last verse: "He hath made Him to be sin for us."

The method of reconciliation is to impute the man's sins to Christ, and not to the man, and impute Christ's righteousness to the man. Christ is to be accounted a sinner in the place of the man, and the man righteous in the place of Christ. God made the just one to take the place of the unjust one.

The strongest passage in the Word of God on the doctrine of substitution and imputation is II Cor. 5:21. No man who denies what is called the doctrine of imputation has ever been able to properly interpret this passage.

This method is perfectly in harmony with what the prophet declared in Isaiah 53: "Our iniquities were laid on Him. By His stripes we are healed. The chastise-

ment of our peace was on Him, and because it was on Him it pleased the Lord to bruise Him." God bruised Him. He poured out His soul unto death and made an offering of himself for the sinner.

What is the blessing that hereby comes to the sinner? The forgiveness of sin. If the sinner's sins are charged to somebody else, and that sinner is acquitted, then he is free. If a brother owes $100 and the surety pays it, the creditor cannot collect that $100 from the original debtor, for the debt has been paid by the surety. So far we have considered reconciliation God-ward. God cannot, by His nature and attributes, be reconciled to the sinner until satisfaction be made to His infracted law. He must be propitiated before He can become propitious. His justice-claims must be met and satisfied.

But what is the ministry of the reconciliation? The text says, "And hath given to us the ministry of reconciliation." The ministry of reconciliation is God's appointing men to go and preach the terms of reconciliation. What authority then is conferred upon the preacher that goes to preach this? "We are ambassadors of Christ." What is an ambassador? The United States sends an ambassador to England, and gives him credentials. At the court of St. James in England he is the representative of the United States. Whatever he does under that authority binds the United States. But an ambassador is not allowed to go beyond his instructions, and any ambassador that goes beyond them must be held responsible to the government that sent him.

A preacher then goes with divine instructions not to say, "peace, peace when there is no peace," but to set plainly before the unconverted the only terms of reconciliation—that the sinner shall repent of his sins and accept the Lord, and the evidence that he has accepted

Christ is that he no longer lives unto himself but unto Christ, no longer as the world judges, but according to the Spirit of God. That is the whole subject of the gospel in a nutshell. It is of the highest importance that a preacher should understand it. "We are ambassadors therefore on behalf of Christ, as though God were entreating by us: We beseech you on behalf of Christ, be ye reconciled to God." I consider that the most important thought in the second letter. The work of Christ reconciles God to man. The work of the Holy Spirit reconciles man to God.

Taking up chapter 6, let us advance in the thought. What is the time to be reconciled?

> "At an acceptable time I hearkened unto thee,
> And in a day of salvation did I succor thee;
> Behold, now is the acceptable time;
> Behold, now is the day of salvation."

That is, no minister has a right to treat with a sinner on the morrow, next week, or next year. He has to hold the sinner down in every sermon to immediate reconciliation with Christ.

Mr. Spurgeon, in talking to his preacher-students, tells of an incident that he witnessed. He was visiting an Episcopalian preacher, and a man under conviction of sin came to see his pastor. He told Mr. Spurgeon to stay and hear what the man had to say. The sinner stated his case. The preacher said, "You go home and read a certain book on the "Evidences of Christianity" and read certain passages, and pray to the Lord, and in a week come back to see me." Mr. Spurgeon leaped to his feet and said, "My dear sir, don't dismiss that man that way. You have no right to do it. He comes to you as an anxious sinner, for you to tell him what to do, and you have marked out a line of conduct that may take him

beyond his life time. If you will permit me, I will tell him what to do. Let him now accept Christ; let us pray now that he may at once accept Christ." The Episcopalian said, "If you want to do it, do so." Mr. Spurgeon said to the man, "Will you right now look to the Lord Jesus Christ while we pray," and he knelt down to pray and the man arose happily converted.

We should never postpone a convicted sinner's case. If the man is not under conviction we may work to convict. But when a contrite and penitent man comes, who feels that he is a sinner, and wants to know what to do to be saved, we should deal with him just as Paul did with that jailer at midnight, who said, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" Paul answered, "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved." He was saved that very night. There is the great failure in most meetings.

One Sunday in Oklahoma City I preached three times. I suppose there were fully 2,500 that heard the sermons. The audience room was very large, and it was crowded. In the afternoon I was preaching to men, and I came to the point of immediate reconciliation to God. Since God is the author of this reconciliation, and since the blessing of reconciliation is remission of sins, and since that comes by imputation of our guilt to Christ, and the imputation of His righteousness to us, what use is there for us to take time? If salvation be a gift, how long does it take to receive a gift? A wonderful impression was made. Three men came to see me after the sermon on the subject of immediate acceptance of Christ. One of them offered me an extravagant sum of money if I would stay and hold a meeting.

I heard a very distinguished preacher take this text: "We beseech you in Christ's stead be ye reconciled to

God." The main thing he preached about was this: That there were two parties to the original enmity, God and man; that the man did not have to do anything to reconcile God; that the man was the only fellow out of it; that God is already reconciled, and the man must bring himself to bear upon reconciling himself. When he got through I said, "Do you know that you have made a dreadful mistake? God's reconciliation is in Christ, and so long as man rejects Christ, God is not reconciled to that man; the wrath of God is on him." It was Christ that appeased the wrath of God by dying for the sinner, but it does not follow that because Christ died nearly 1900 years ago the law has nothing against us. It has nothing against us only when we accept Christ.

The reconciliation of God to us is not out of Christ, but in Christ, but we get in touch with that reconciliation when we accept Christ.

What then should be the conduct of a preacher who has this ministry of reconciliation? Verses 3-10 constitute a lesson to a preacher: "Giving no occasion of stumbling in anything, that our ministration be not blamed; but in everything commending ourselves, as ministers of God, in much patience, in afflictions, in necessities, in distresses, in stripes, in imprisonments, in tumults, in labors, in watchings, in fastings, in pureness, in knowledge, in longsuffering, in kindness, in the Holy Spirit, in love unfeigned, in the word of truth, in the power of God; by the armor of righteousness on the right hand and on the left, by glory and dishonor, by evil report and good report; as deceivers, and yet true; as unknown, and yet well known; as dying, and behold, we live; as chastened, and not killed; as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing; as poor, yet making many rich; as having nothing, and yet possessing all things."

Now comes another point in the argument—since a man who is a new creature is to live not unto himself but unto Jesus Christ, how does it affect his past relations with men and things? Verses 14-17 answer: "Be not unequally yoked with unbelievers; for what fellowship have righteousness and iniquity, or what communion hath light with darkness? And what concord hath Christ with Belial? Or what portion hath a believer with an unbeliever? And what agreement hath a temple of God with idols, for we are a temple of the living God; even as God said, I will dwell in them, and walk in them; and I will be their God, and they shall be my people. Wherefore,

> Come ye out from among them, and be ye separate,
> saith the Lord,
> And touch no unclean thing."

What follows from being a new creature? A man must draw a line of demarcation between himself and every evil thing and evil association. The argument is tremendous.

We now come to the second and most important part of the whole letter—his discussion of repentance. What precedes repentance? Godly sorrow, or contrition. "Godly sorrow worketh repentance." What does repentance mean? A change of mind toward God on account of sin. How is repentance distinguished from worldly sorrow? Worldly sorrow has a different origin; it is remorse. How is repentance evidenced? Look at the 11th verse: "For behold, this selfsame thing, that ye were made sorry after a Godly sort, what earnest care it wrought in you, yea what clearing of yourselves, yea what indignation, yea what fear, yea what longing, yea what zeal, yea what avenging." They had partaken of the sin of that fornicator, and were not disturbed

until Paul wrote this letter which brought about Godly sorrow in their hearts, and led them to repent. Their repentance was evidenced by its fruits. They cleared themselves of the offense by excluding that man, and what is true of Godly sorrow and repentance there is true of repentance on the part of the sinner. There is no other mill that grinds out that kind of grist. John the Baptist said, "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance. Don't oppress the poor, but be content with your wage." If a man is a Christian let him prove it by a Christian life.

QUESTIONS

1. What is the meaning of "fear of the Lord" in II Cor. 5:11?
2. What the meaning of "constrain" in 5:14?
3. What is the force of "therefore" in 5:17, and what the two reasons given in this passage why a man is a new creature?
4. What the meaning and application of "old things . . . they are become new," in 5:17? Illustrate.
5. What bearing has 5:17 on the evidence of salvation?
6. What the preacher's duty relative to his text when he goes to preach, and what illustration of a violation of this rule given by the author?
7. What, according to the author's estimate, is the most important part of this letter, and why?
8. What does the word, "reconciliation," imply?
9. What does it mean?
10. Who is the author of our reconciliation in salvation?
11. What is the meritorious ground of reconciliation?
12. What the method of this reconciliation?
13. What the strongest passage in the Word of God on imputation, and the prophetic teaching on this subject?
14. What the blessing of reconciliation? Illustrate.
15. What is the ministry of the reconciliation?
16. What the authority conferred upon the preacher? Illustrate.
17. What, then, the preacher's evident duty?
18. What reconciles God to man, and what reconciles men to God?
19. What the time of reconciliation, and why? Illustrate.
20. What illustration of a misconception of reconciliation, and how did the author correct this misconception?
21. What should be the conduct of a preacher who has this reconciliation?

22. How does the "new creation" affect a man's past relations with men and things?
23. What the second most important part of this letter?
24. What precedes repentance?
25. What does repentance mean?
26. How is repentance distinguished from worldly sorrow?
27. How is repentance evidenced, and particularly in this case?

XXX

THE GREAT COLLECTION FOR THE POOR SAINTS AT JERUSALEM

Scripture: II Cor. 8: 1–9: 15

THE Great Collection discussed in II Cor. 8 and 9 was for the benefit of the poor saints in Jerusalem. We learn from Acts 2:44, 45; 4:32-37; 5:1-11; 6:1-4, the following facts:

1. That in the great revival following Pentecost, and lasting three years and a half, up to the dispersion brought about by Saul's persecution, vast multitudes of the Jews of the dispersion being gathered to attend the annual feasts remained over in Jerusalem on account of the revival, that every year at the feasts this multitude was increased, and that as the majority of the converted were from the poor, very great poverty existed in the church. This constitutes the occasion of these collections.

2. That to relieve this destitution extraordinary, but voluntary donations were contributed by the wealthier class of Christians in order to form a relief fund to be distributed by the apostles.

3. That in connection with donations to this fund occurred the dramatic tragedy of Ananias and Sapphira.

4. That complaints arising among the Christian Jews of the dispersion as to an equitable division of this fund, brought about the creation of the office of deacon.

We learn from Acts 11:27-30 that a great dearth

throughout the world so greatly enhanced the destitution in Jerusalem that the Antioch church took a relief collection and sent it for distribution to the elders of the Jerusalem church, by Barnabas and Paul. This is the first outside collection on record for the poor saints in Jerusalem. We learn also from Gal. 2:10 that James, Peter and John urged Barnabas and Paul, missionaries to the Gentiles, to remember the Christian poor at Jerusalem, which was in the private conference preceding the public conference, both of which are described in Acts 15:1-21. The distress of poverty among the Jerusalem saints must have been very great and persistent to justify this appeal. It was in reference to this necessity and appeal that Paul, in accordance with his promise, is responding in this section.

The scriptures bearing directly on these collections are: I Cor. 16:1-4; II Cor. 8, 9; Rom. 15:25-28; Acts 20:4; 24:17. From these passages we learn the extent and range of the collections; that all the churches of Galatia in Asia Minor, all the churches in Macedonia, all the churches in Achaia took part. There may have been others, but these are specifically named. It was a series of collections in which two continents participated. From the presence of Trophimus, the Ephesian, and Tychicus in Jerusalem with him when he tendered the collection, (Acts 20:4; 24:17; 21:18) we may infer that proconsular Asia participated in the collection.

The ground of obligation cited by Paul to justify the collections by his Gentile converts is one of debt, thus expressed: "For if the Gentiles have been made partakers of their spiritual things, they owe it to them also to minister unto them in carnal things"—Rom. 15:27. Paul's coadjutors in engineering these collections were

Titus, Timothy and others whose names are not given.

The seven rules governing these collections were as follows:

1. As to time, they should, every Sunday, or on the first day of the week, lay by in store until the accumulated fund was ready to be forwarded—I Cor. 16:2.

2. Let the contribution of each be "according as God has prospered him"—I Cor. 16:2. "According as a man hath—not according as he hath not"—II Cor. 8:12.

3. It must be voluntary—"of a willing mind"—II Cor. 8:12.

4. It must be deliberate, *i. e.,* according to a previous purpose—II Cor. 9:7 and 8:17.

5. It must be cheerfully done, not grudgingly or of compulsion—II Cor. 9:7.

6. The donor must have first given himself to the Lord—II Cor. 8:5.

7. It is to promote equality—II Cor. 8:13-15.

The motives to which appeals were made are both higher and lower. The higher motives were:

1. The example of their Lord—II Cor. 8:9.

2. As we sow, so shall we reap—II Cor. 9:6.

3. God's grace will care for us—II Cor. 9:8.

4. It is a deed of righteousness—II Cor. 9:9,10.

5. This service not only supplied the need of the poor saints but awakened many thanksgivings to God—II Cor. 9:11, 12.

6. The recipients of the bounty glorify God on account of the donor's subjection to God—II Cor. 9:13.

7. They pray for them and long after them—II Cor. 9:14.

8. They should abound in the grace of giving as in other graces—II Cor. 8:7.

The lower motives were:

1. The example of the Macedonian churches—II Cor. 8:1-5.

2. To prove the sincerity of their love—II Cor. 8:8.

3. It is expedient to carry on what has been begun—II Cor. 8:10.

4. They had pledged to help, and should redeem their pledges—II Cor. 8:11. Compare Eccles. 5:4-6.

5. The zeal of their pledges had stimulated others, (II Cor. 9:2) and shame would follow if their pledges were unredeemed—II Cor. 9:3, 4.

6. On account of their zeal in pledging the apostle had boasted of their readiness, and he would be put to shame if the pledges were unredeemed—II Cor. 9:2-4.

Wise steps were taken to guard against suspicion and misapprehension in regard to taking collections, and the handling and disbursement of the funds collected. Only the most discreet and trustworthy men were appointed as collecting agents, (II Cor. 8:16-18 and 12:18, 19) and the churches themselves appointed the messengers who should have charge of the funds collected—II Cor. 8:19-23 and Acts 20:4. Among these collecting and transporting agents, the brother "whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches," (II Cor. 8:18) was most likely Luke, as we know from the pronoun, "us," in Acts 21:18 that he was of the number who went with Paul to Jerusalem when he carried the collection there.

The application of the principle involved to other kingdom enterprises are as follows:

1. As all the particular churches are related to the same King and kingdom, their co-operation in kingdom enterprises on some equitable method is mandatory.

2. That the method most approved by experience, and which conserves the independence of the churches

and expresses their independence, is by voluntary associations and conventions through messengers of the churches.

3. *That whatever the plan of association for eliciting, combining and directing the funds of the churches, there must be no projecting of a church into an association or convention so as to merge its sovereignty into a denominational body having appellate jurisdiction over the private affairs of the churches.*

4. That on the voluntary principle and by messengers, such a co-operation may be attained as will serve for all kingdom purposes.

5. That such care must be taken in collecting, handling and distributing such common fund as will remove all just grounds for suspicion.

QUESTIONS

1. For whose benefit was the collection which is discussed in II Cor. 8 and 9?
2. What scriptures furnish the background of so many and so great collections?
3. What the occasion of these collections?
4. How was this extraordinary destitution relieved?
5. What dramatic tragedy in this connection?
6. What office was created in the church at this time, and what the occasion of it?
7. What the first collection for these poor saints, and what its occasion?
8. What indicates the great and persistent distress of poverty among the Jerusalem-saints?
9. What, then, brought forth this discussion in II Cor. 8 and 9?
10. What the scriptures bearing directly on these collections?
11. From these and other scriptures, what do we learn as to the extent and range of these collections?
12. What is the ground of obligation cited by Paul to justify the collection by his Gentile converts?
13. Who were Paul's coadjutors in engineering these collections?
14. What the seven rules governing these collections?
15. What the higher motives?

16. What the lower motives?
17. What wise steps were taken to guard against suspicion and misapprehension in regard to taking collections and the handling and disbursement of the funds collected?
18. Among these collecting and transporting agents, who most likely was the brother "whose praise in the gospel is spread through all the churches," and why?
19. What the application of the principle involved to other kingdom-enterprises?

XXXI

EXPOSITION—PART VI

PAUL'S REPLY TO HIS ENEMIES

Scripture: II Cor. 10:1–12:21

THIS discussion, commencing at chapter 10, closes up the second letter to the Corinthians. This closing section of the book is so utterly unlike the preceding part, that a great many people try to make it a part of a different letter, but they are very much mistaken. The difference arises from the fact that the first nine chapters were addressed to the working majority of the church, and these last chapters refer to the incorrigible minority. The object of the last section is to defend the apostleship and gospel of Paul from the charges made by certain Jewish emissaries who came from Jerusalem to that place, as at other places where he had been, and endeavored to wreck his work. We have considered this matter somewhat in our exposition of the former letter. We will consider it much more in the next two letters—Galatians and Romans. In these four letters the great controversy is discussed.

The charges of these Jewish brethren with their letters of recommendation were about these: First, he was not coming to them; he kept saying he would come, and even if he should come, he would be very humble when present, though bold in his absence. Second, that he

boasted too much of his apostolic authority, trying to overawe the people with his letters, though when present his person was insignificant and his speech contemptible. Third, that he was not in his proper sphere—not a true apostle, not even a true Jew; that he virtually confessed he was not an apostle by not asserting his apostolic authority, as Peter in killing Ananias and Sapphira; that he confessed it in not exacting support from the people to whom he preached, but that while he did not exact any money while he was there, he was arranging for a very large collection. Why should those poor people at Corinth be taking up a collection for some interest away off yonder, unless Paul wanted to scoop the money into his own hands? Of course, his not taking money when he was there was that he might send Titus, his henchman, and take a big collection for himself. In other words, being crafty, he caught them with guile to make gain of them.

Of course, these charges are inferred from his defense. We see into his very heart, so sensitive and so deeply wounded, that he is forced to the seeming folly of boasting. We, in our day, rejoice that their assault led to so many rich disclosures of his life and heart that otherwise his modesty would have concealed. It is never a pleasant thing to expose rascality. But we have this pleasure—if these men had not preferred these charges, we never would have had the statement in these chapters which are of imperishable value to the world.

He commences by making his reply to the charges that he was a very humble, modest man when he is present, but when he is absent he is bold: "Now I, Paul, myself entreat you by the meekness and gentleness of Christ, I who in your presence am lowly among you, but being absent am of good courage toward you; yea, I

beseech you, that I may not when present show courage with the confidence wherewith I could be bold against some, who count of us as if we walked according to the flesh." In other words, he did not want to assume this boldness, because God did not give him this power except for the purpose of building up. Only with great reluctance did Paul ever use his apostolic power to vindicate himself, and never unless the gospel was jeopardized and needed vindication. He had this power, which was not carnal, but was of God. In the exercise of this power he could reach any wicked imagination of their hearts; he would pull down any stronghold of opposition. He had but to speak the word and God would attest the truth of the word. But for himself, in his love for them, he deprecated such use of the power. They had judged according to the external appearance when they concluded that because he was a modest and humble man, therefore he did not have the apostolic power. Some people parade their authority and want to show it off. Paul preferred to reach men by persuasion, to govern by gentleness, always to win and not to drive.

With reference to his personal appearance and his speech, he uses this language: "That I may not seem as if I would terrify you by my letters. 'For, his letters,' they say, 'are weighty and strong; but his bodily presence is weak, and his speech is of no account.' Let such a one reckon this, that, what we are in word by letters when we are absent, such are we also in deed when we are present." They made the mistake of using the wrong standard of measurement, and this gives us a fine text to preach from. In the King James version it reads: "They, measuring themselves by themselves, and comparing themselves among themselves, are not wise."

Whenever any fallible test is made a standard of measurement we are certain to bring about a wrong result.

When I was a young preacher I preached on that text. I stated that I decided to put up a picket fence around my place, and as I needed exercise, I thought I would saw the pickets for myself. I sawed off one just long enough to measure by, then the next one by that, and the third by the second, and so on. When I put up my pickets I found there was an inch and a half difference in the height. Every variation that you make repeats and magnifies itself. We must have one fixed standard of measurement and use that standard every time we saw a picket. God has given one standard.

We don't say that everybody must come up to the measure of Sam Houston or Daniel Webster. When we hear religious experiences we do not say that they must all be alike. We may not have had the same length of despondency as someone else. All we have to do is to tell our experience and let it be measured by God's Word. No human standard can be good. Some people imitate others. Some preachers select an ideal preacher, and try to imitate him. There used to be a Negro preacher that tried to imitate Dr. Burleson. He would enter the house carrying his big silk hat, bow and sit down like Dr. Burleson, and strange to say, measuring by human standards, people more often imitate the follies than the excellencies. Paul says, "These men have come here on the field of my labor and set up an arbitrary standard of measurement, and they want to make me fit it. I will only be measured by God's standard, not man's."

Continuing his argument, he says with reference to the sphere, "But we will not glory beyond our measure, but according to the measure of the province which God

apportioned to us as a measure, to reach even unto you. For we stretch not ourselves overmuch, as though we reached not unto you; for we came even as far as unto you in the gospel of Christ."

I think the greatest missionary sermon I ever preached was from that text: "We came even as far as you in the gospel of Christ, having hope that, as your faith groweth, we shall preach the gospel in the regions beyond you." I drew an historical picture of the progress of the gospel, commencing at Jerusalem, until at this time it had reached Corinth in Europe. It represented many long journeys and varied experiences of Paul. Paul's rule was when he reached a place not to conduct all of his campaign from the original base, but to make the new church a new base: "I have this hope, that I shall establish a missionary church at Corinth, and that through that missionary church, I shall reach out to the region beyond, and establish other missionary churches beyond you, and use them as a base to reach others yet beyond." That discloses Paul's method of work. That province had been assigned to him by the Lord Jesus Christ. They claimed that he was out of his sphere. Peter and James recognized that God had sent Paul to the Gentiles. They gave him the right hand of fellowship on that. God's providence had met him there. God's Spirit had blessed him there, and he was not building on any other man's foundation.

The next chapter commences this way: "Would that ye could bear with me in a little foolishness." They claimed that he was foolish. "Well, hear a little foolishness. You bear with people who are more foolish." Notice what he says about what they had borne. If one should even slap them in the face they would bear it. "Now bear with me. I am indeed jealous over you, but

it is a Godly jealousy. I haven't that envy and jealousy that one preacher has for another preacher lest the one beat me preaching. My jealousy is one that God approves. There come preachers to you who do not preach the true gospel, who come in another spirit and preach another Jesus, and as the serpent beguiled Eve with subtility, so will they seduce you. For if he that cometh preacheth another Jesus, whom we did not preach, or if ye receive a different spirit, which ye did not receive, or a different gospel, which ye did not accept, ye do well to bear with him. For I reckon that I am not a whit behind the very chiefest apostles." Their next objection was that Paul was not a trained orator: "But though I be rude in speech, yet I am not in knowledge."

As to that question of support, he says, "Did I commit a sin . . . because I preached to you the gospel of God for nought? I did receive wages from other churches. Part of the time I supported myself and part of the time the Macedonian churches supplied my necessities while I preached to you. Instead of being led to refrain from claiming support because I distrusted my apostolic right to do that, my object was an entirely different one. I had a number of lessons I wanted to teach you. One reason was that I might take away from anybody who sought occasion to object to my ministry on that account. I wanted to teach you lessons as I taught the Thessalonians, that men ought to work; that industry is a good thing." He says, "It was wrong I did you and I ask you to forgive the wrong."

It is a sin for the gospel to be preached contrary to the declaration of Christ that "they that preach the gospel should live of the gospel."

Every enterprise should pay its own expenses and yield its fruits to the laborer. "I made you inferior in

this, that I took away from you the dignity of paying for the gospel preached to you."

I discussed that question before the Southern Baptist Convention once when there was such a hue and cry against agents. I told this anecdote: An Irishman had only one load of powder and shot, and he had to have something to eat. He saw a coon up a tree and fired at it. The coon fell out and hit the ground so hard that it burst open. The Irishman said, "Faith, and what a fool I was to waste that load of ammunition; the fall would have killed him." There are people who talk about a waste of ammunition, but coons don't fall out of the tops of trees unless someone wastes a load of shot on them.

Let us look at 11:20: "For ye bear with a man, if he bringeth you into bondage, if he devoureth you, if he taketh you captive, if he exalteth himself, if he smiteth you on the face." Those fellows with those letters of recommendation were very exalted beings, and demanded high recognition; there was no humility about them. They claimed money, and they got money, and they brought the people from gospel freedom into bondage, and they would even insult them by slapping them in the face. There are some people who are never influenced by gentle means. The old Webster spelling book tells us that a man may talk softly to a boy up an apple tree and he won't come down. He may throw turf at him and he won't come down. He has to rock him to get him down. There are some people who want a leader that will knock them down and drag them out, and they have no respect for a leader that cannot fight and call somebody a liar. The one who shot down the most men in western towns used to be a hero. Paul says that these people were like those who cringe before their masters

like dogs. That reminds me of Æsop's fable of King Log.

As to the charge that he was not a Jew, here is his reply: "Are they Hebrews? So am I. Are they Israelites? So am I. Are they seed of Abraham? So am I. Are they ministers of Christ? I am more." Now follows a passage of scripture that ought to be written in letters of gold and carried with every preacher. It shows what Paul had suffered for the gospel up to this time: "In labors more abundantly, in prisons more abundantly, in stripes above measure, in deaths oft. Of the Jews five times received I forty stripes save one. Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned, thrice I suffered shipwreck, a night and a day have I been in the deep; in journeyings often, in perils of rivers, in perils of robbers, in perils from my countrymen, in perils from the Gentiles, in perils in the city, in perils in the wilderness, in perils in the sea, in perils among false brethren; in labor and travail, in watchings often, in hunger and thirst, in fastings often, in cold and nakedness. Besides those things that are without, there is that which presseth upon me daily—anxiety for all the churches."

I suppose if we put together the labors and sufferings of all the other apostles, they would not equal the sufferings of this one man. When we read the book of Acts, we do not read about any of these shipwrecks, and only one of the scourgings—the one at Philippi by the Roman lictors. Scarcely any of the other perils are mentioned.

No wonder John Mark got scared when they left the Isle of Cyprus and went on to the mainland. Up those mountains, and swimming those river-torrents, and meeting those robbers, Paul's every step was into the jaws of death, always the Spirit of God bearing witness with his spirit that bonds and imprisonments awaited him.

He counted it the same as breathing, and more certain than food, for often he did not know he would get any food. How many times do we preachers suffer real hunger in doing our duty as preachers? Do we ever swim creeks? How many times have we been in jail and whipped by the magistrates?

They used to whip Baptist preachers in Virginia, and in ungodly New England it was a devout exercise to banish Quakers and whip Baptists. I have the history of the old Philadelphia Association. Within four years of the time that the battle of Lexington was fought, and almost within sight of the battleground, a large community of Baptists were taxed to build a meeting house for the Congregationalists in a community where there were no Congregationalists. Whenever they did not pay the tax readily, law officers came and attached the center acre of their farms or gardens, and then under forced auction sales, their enemies would bid in their property for a song.

We are living in a good, easy time But our fathers have been tested. It is certainly true that throughout the dark ages whoever was true to the gospel of Jesus Christ walked at least somewhat in the steps of Paul. There are historians who are unable to see any connection between the Baptists of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries and the preceding sufferings for Christ, but they are very dim-eyed. The gospel is always transmitted by men. Paul says, "What I commit to you, do you commit to faithful men who shall come after you." Somebody carries the gospel, and it always broke out in the places where these faithful preachers went. They could not publish books and preach in houses. They had to preach in the caverns of the earth, and even in pious Switzerland where John Calvin laid the foundation

of Presbyterianism, the men who insisted on immersion as baptism were condemned to be drowned: "If you will dip, we will dip you."

In chapter 12 he comes to another proof of his authority—the revelations made to him. We have read nothing of this in the preceding history. It occurred during his Cilician ministry, to which there are only two New Testament references: "I know a man in Christ, fourteen years ago (whether in the body, I know not; or whether out of the body, I know not; God knoweth); such a one caught up even to the third heaven. And I know such a man (whether in the body, or apart from the body, I know not; God knoweth) how that he was caught up into Paradise, and heard unspeakable words, which it is not lawful for man to utter." In other words, "You say I am not an apostle. This is only one of the many experiences that I have had with my Lord." This man was selected as a special medium of divine revelation, and God honored him by catching him up to the third heaven—the Paradise of God. The word Paradise occurs here, and where the Savior spoke it on the cross: "This day shalt thou be with me in Paradise," and in the third chapter of Revelation: "To him that overcometh to him will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the Paradise of God." These are the only three places where the word occurs in the New Testament, and from these passages it is easy to see where Paul was carried. The tree of life was in the midst of the Paradise of God, and the last of Revelation locates that tree of life: "And he shewed me a pure river of water of life, clear as crystal, proceeding out of the throne of God and of the Lamb." That is Paradise regained—the Paradise that the original Paradise typified. The first Adam lost the type, and the Second Adam gained the anti-type. Paul says, "I

do not know whether it was just my spirit taken out of my body and carried up there—I cannot answer that psychological question—but I know that God caught me up into the Paradise of heaven. I heard things not proper to tell now." Notice that Lazarus told nothing as to his experiences the other side of the grave. Our revelation must come from God.

Now Paul says, "By reason of the exceeding greatness of the revelations, that I should not be exalted overmuch, there was given to me a thorn in the flesh, a messenger of Satan to buffet me." Of course, everybody wants to know what that thorn in the flesh was, but we can only conjecture. I infer from some statements in the Letter to the Galatians that it was his weak eyes. He had to be led around, and have his letters written. He wrote the Letter to the Galatians with his own hand, and calls attention to the "sprawling letters." He says the Galatians were so much in love with the gospel he preached that they would have plucked out their own eyes and given him. So I infer that the devil was permitted to afflict him. He prayed three times that the affliction might be taken away. There are two other cases where three prayers were made to God like this case, and where those praying did not get the request in the form they asked for it. God did not take away the thorn in the flesh, but He answered Paul's prayer by giving him grace to bear it.

In regard to that money-business he says, "I did not myself burden you, but, being crafty, I caught you with guile." We must understand these words as quoted by him. It was the charge of his enemies to which he replies: "Did I take advantage of you by any one of them whom I have sent unto you? I exhorted Titus, and I sent the other brother with him. Did Titus take

any advantage of you? Walked we not in the same spirit? Walked we not in the same steps?" I don't suppose any man ever acted more prudently than Paul did in the management of money.

QUESTIONS

1. What can you say of the closing section, chapter 10-13, of II Cor., and from what does the difference arise?
2. What the object of this last section, and where may we find the discussion extended?
3. What the charges of the Judaizers, and how did they say that he acknowledged that he was not an apostle?
4. What Paul's reply to the charge that he was humble and modest when present, but bold when absent?
5. What his reply to the charge that his letters were weighty and strong, but his bodily presence was weak, etc.?
6. What the mistake of the accusers on this point, what illustration from the experience of the author, and what the application to the Christian experience?
7. What Paul's reply to the accusation that he was out of his sphere, what great missionary text in this connection, what was Paul's method of work as revealed in this reply, and what recognition was given Paul in this sphere?
8. What his reply to the charge that he was foolish?
9. What his answer to the objection that he was not a trained orator?
10. What his reply to the charge that he did not demand a support?
11. What the teaching here on ministerial support? Illustrate.
12. What the character and methods of Paul's Judaizing accusers, and how does this method seem to fit some people? Illustrate.
13. What his reply to the charge that he was not a Jew, and, briefly, what were Paul's sufferings for the gospel up to this time?
14. How does this paragraph from the life of Paul fit our case, and what, briefly, some of the sufferings of our forefathers?
15. What proof of his authority does Paul present in chapter 12, and how does it prove it?
16. What three passages in the Bible contain the word, "Paradise," and where is Paradise?
17. What was Paul's "thorn in the flesh," and why was it given him?
18. What God's answer to his prayer respecting it, and what other similar cases in the Bible?
19. How did Paul reply to their charge respecting the money-matter?

Note: For the first part of the discussion of the revolt against apostolic authority, see chapter XVI.